

THE CANADIAN FORUM

Twenty-Second Year of Issue

January 1943

LIBRARY
MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

Jan 8 - '48

THE PRO AND CON PARTY
Editorial

FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY
L. A. Mackay

DEMOCRATIC DEFEAT
Morley Ayearst

A HOUSING PLAN FOR CANADA
J. F. C. Smith

**CBC AND
THE GOVERNMENT**
R. B. Tolbridge

**MR. SMITH'S GERMAN
REVOLUTION**
Martin Dell

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

O CANADA	290
EDITORIALS	291
THE PRO AND CON PARTY	293
STEVEN CARTWRIGHT— <i>Lionel Gelber</i>	294
FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY— <i>L. A. MacKay</i>	295
AS STREAMS TURN LANGOUROUSLY— <i>Carol Ely Harper</i>	297
ART— <i>Rita Smith</i>	297
SKY— <i>Ann Bernard</i>	297
DEMOCRATIC DEFEAT— <i>Morley Ayearst</i>	297
The CBC AND THE GOVERNMENT— <i>R. B. Tolbridge</i>	299
TOBACCO— <i>R. E. K. Pemberton</i>	302
CORRESPONDENCE	303
WINTER WEATHER— <i>James Wreford</i>	303
ONLY BE SILENT— <i>Gilean Douglas</i>	303
LADY REMINGTON— <i>Lieut. Irving Layton</i>	303
NUTRITION— <i>Genevieve Allan</i>	304
A HOUSING PLAN FOR CANADA— <i>J. F. C. Smith</i>	305
IN ABRAHAM'S BOSOM— <i>George Curtsinger</i>	307
OPTIONAL— <i>Margaret Avison</i>	307
PROPHET OF THE NORTH— <i>D. M. LeBourdais</i>	307
MR. SMITH'S GERMAN REVOLUTION— <i>Martin Dell</i>	309

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

THE ROBE	M.I.T.	310
THE CHILEAN POPULAR FRONT	Josephine Hambleton	310
ADMINISTRATION OF LABOUR	H. A. Logan	310
ECONOMICS FOR WORKERS	H. A. Logan	311

THE CANADIAN FORUM

Eleanor Godfrey - Managing Editor
L. A. Morris - Business Manager

Published each month by

CANADIAN FORUM LIMITED

28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Phone WA. 5118

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM

(Cheques must be payable at par in Toronto)

O CANADA

Roland Glaude, who reported finding ten sticks of dynamite beneath local railway bridge Monday evening, confesses to authority that hoax was perpetrated in desire to obtain prison term and government medical treatment.

(Sub-heading in the Sherbrooke Daily Record, Nov. 25, 1942.)

The former Canadian prime minister took issue with Wendell Willkie for recent references to India . . . At the outset Lord Bennett remarked that many completely misunderstood the whole fabric of the empire. "Some have even said they would not have us as companions if we are fighting to maintain the integrity of this empire. Well, we are. And please God we will win."

(From The Free Press Prairie Farmer, Winnipeg, Man., Nov. 4, 1942.)

D. G. McKenzie of Winnipeg, president of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce . . . said yesterday in an address to the Ottawa Board of Trade that one of the many serious problems of the post-war period will be the choice between state socialism and free enterprise. If the former is chosen, he said, it will mean the end of all the freedoms for which Canada is fighting . . . No other organizations were so equipped to give leadership through the difficult times ahead as the Chamber of Commerce and Boards of Trade.

(From The Montreal Star, Oct. 31, 1942.)

Referring to "bitter criticism" which, he said, had been heard of the empire in recent months, the governor-general said "I for one welcome such criticism. Most of it is due to ignorance, and people should never be reproached for their scanty knowledge of so complex a mechanism as the British Empire. Most of our own people know very little about it themselves, so we cannot expect even our best friends to know more."

(From the report of a speech before a meeting of the Empire Club by the Earl of Athlone, Governor-General of Canada in the Toronto Star.)

Wells' history is a veritable millstone on the road to learning.

(The Brunswickan—Literary journal of the University of New Brunswick, Nov. 27, 1942.)

"The only Tories I know of in Canada are men in the high command of the Liberal party. No greater Tory exists in Canada than Mr. Mackenzie King."

(R. B. Hanson, at the Winnipeg Convention, as reported in the Toronto Telegram, Dec. 9, 1942.)

When I last appeared before you, I used these words: "Democracy gives us great privileges, but every privilege has its corresponding duty; to keep the privileges we must be prepared to sacrifice everything except ultimate freedom itself. When the war is over, it is essential that Government controls and regulations be removed with all possible speed, for if we are to continue in a system of free enterprise for which we are fighting, it is to private enterprise that we must look for resumption of normal activities."

Since these words were spoken, we have gone a long way toward sacrificing everything except liberty itself . . . We gladly submit to such temporary sacrifices because the alternative is having them imposed upon us permanently by brutal foreign taskmasters. But never . . . let us forget that on the shoulders of free enterprise stand those other freedoms that make up democracy—freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of labor, and equality before the law.

(Huntley Drummond, President, Bank of Montreal, addressing annual meeting, Dec. 7, 1942.)

Rally cry of a hundred meetings was, "Are you a Progressive-Conservative?" At first it was used to gain information and toward midnight it became a habit . . . A weary girl elevator operator leaned against her starting handle and pondered the way of politicians.

"Are you a Progressive-Conservative?" she was asked. Slowly she straightened. "I am," she declared, "a continuing Methodist," and closed the door.

(From staff dispatch to The Globe and Mail from Conservative Convention, Winnipeg, Dec. 20, 1942.)

Items listed in recent Canadian newspaper advertisements: Sterling Silver Brush, Comb and Mirror, \$52.00; Man's Leather Billfold, \$25.00; Cedar Chest, \$100.00; Sheffield Style Silver Tray, \$100.00; Table Lamp with Rayon Shade, \$73.50; "leather effect" Waste-Basket for man's room, \$9.50.

This month's prize of six months subscription goes to R. Alex Sim, Sherbrooke, P.Q. All contributions should contain original clipping, date and name of publication from which taken.

THE CANADIAN FORUM

Vol. XXII, No. 264



Founded 1920

Toronto, Ontario, January, 1943

People's War

What a month it has been! French warships scuttled by their own crews at Toulon . . . "unoccupied" France occupied by the Nazis . . . swift collapse of the Petain regime, and frantic efforts by Hitler and Laval to draft more and more French workers into German war industry. Consolidation of General Eisenhower's deal with the ill-fated Darlan (characterized as "temporary" by President Roosevelt) . . . France's No. 2 Quisling placed in civil command of the North African empire . . . Dakar handed over without a blow . . . Darlan's avowal of complete accord with Hitler's enemies and disavowal of "personal ambitions". Doubt and confusion amongst De Gaulle's Fighting French, and demands for apologies from its critics by the American state department. Meanwhile, the British and American armies slowly converging on Tunis and Bizerte, into which Hitler is pouring troops for the decisive battle which will determine the fate of North Africa and the possibility of a major move against the Axis from that quarter. Meanwhile, also, a strengthening of Hitler's *Waffen SS*, a campaign of terror by Gestapo forces throughout Europe, and a propaganda drive by Goebbels to "explain" the African reverses, all of which indicates that the Nazis are anxious about internal conditions and are taking no chances. And now, the assassination of Darlan, to bring further complications—or a solution?—to the political problem in North Africa.

It seems clear now that Stalin knew all along about the plans for the African campaign, and that Churchill was fully advised of Russia's reserve strength and her plans for the counter offensives now in progress around Stalingrad. Cryptic references to a second front in the west, and Russian complaints about the "fulfilling of obligations on time", seem now to have been deliberately designed to confuse the Axis, though the latter remark may have been prompted by lingering doubts in Stalin's mind of the complete sincerity or ability of Britain and the United States with regard to the projected African move.

But any possible doubts on this point have now been answered, and the Russians are certainly living up to their obligations, with the help, apparently, of an increasing flow of supplies from Britain and America and a certain relief from air pressure due to the African developments. Some American commentators see in all this the emergence of a real "global strategy". The United Nations, they think, have decided to concentrate on Hitler and Mussolini, meanwhile holding Japan at bay, to be polished off by combined action when Europe is freed.

But American and British liberals are still profoundly disturbed by the political implications in the present conduct of the war. Darlan is gone, but Franco, Otto of Hapsburg and certain of the "exiled governments", hover like grimacing ghosts in the background of the political scene. Refusal to clarify our political attitudes and define our real post-war aims (Atlantic Charters, Beveridge Plans, and exchange of birthday greetings notwithstanding)—refusal, in short, to recognize this as a "People's War" with the future of the Common Man as the chief issue—this is not calculated to assist our military efforts by undermining the enemy's strength at home, nor to raise the morale of our own fighters and workers.

As for Canada, our slogan is still "Nothing matters but Victory". The rest is silence, save for the rising clamor for a speedy removal of "controls" from private enterprise (for which we are fighting) when the war ends.

Anything to Beat the CCF

Villification of the C.C.F. reached new heights in the Winnipeg *Free Press* during the by-election campaign in Winnipeg North Centre. A newspaper which, under John Dafoe, became noted for its informed and even-tempered editorial page stooped to the worst kind of distortion and diatribe in its effort to discredit the C.C.F. and its candidate. But the combined energies of the *Free Press* and three Liberal cabinet ministers failed to confuse the popular mind. Mr. Stanley Knowles was elected on a vote larger by 300 than that accorded the late Mr. J. S. Woodsworth in 1940, and 1,400 larger than in 1935, amounting to 70% of the votes cast. The *Free Press* then joined with *Saturday Night* (which has been busy for some time misrepresenting the C.C.F. and apotheosizing "private enterprise") in belittling the Winnipeg victory, claiming that the large number who abstained from voting really elected the C.C.F. candidate. But many working class C.C.F. supporters were undoubtedly prevented from getting to the polls by the 6 o'clock closing. Out of 168 polling sub-divisions, Mr. Knowles had a large majority in all but two, and captured sub-divisions which had formerly gone strongly Liberal or Conservative.

Newspaper snipers have since turned their poisoned bullets on the C.C.F. because Mr. S. J. Farmer resigned from the coalition cabinet formed before Mr. Bracken became leader of the "Progressive"-Conservative party. But Mr. Bracken had already demonstrated his brand of progressiveness by refusing to sponsor Mr. Farmer's bill aimed at strengthening the position of trade unions. Now that Mr. Farmer, whose labor sympathies are not confined to high sounding phrases, has quit in disgust, the *Globe and Mail* is asserting that he was "hounded out of his post" by a group of "party bosses," thus proving to the *Globe and Mail's* satisfaction that C.C.F. strategy "is directed by greed for office." The renunciation of office by a C.C.F. cabinet minister on matters of principle can lead to this deduction only in the mind of one who writes editorials for the *Globe and Mail* or the *Toronto Tely* and is bent on discrediting the C.C.F.

The Beveridge Report

Social security means steady employment, adequate wages, decent houses in healthy surroundings, leisure and the full development of one's special aptitudes by suitable education. Such things cannot be provided for the community at large by private enterprise, but only by social planning and control of monopoly industry. *Social insurance*, on the other hand, seeks to insure the worker against the worst inequalities and abuses of the economic system such as chronic unemployment, industrial accidents, and disabilities of all kinds. It ensures subsistence; it does not do away with poverty but it eliminates pauperism. With the causes or disabilities social insurance is not concerned: some are inherent in any system: old age for example, blindness and disease, while others are characteristic of capitalism. Social insurance seeks to protect people against them all—largely at their own expense.

The Beveridge report is a comprehensive plan of social insurance. As such it is to be welcomed, studied and admired. It nationalizes and simplifies the numerous and chaotic social insurance schemes of Great Britain into one master scheme that covers not only unemployment and industrial insurance but childbirth, burial, and that includes also a national health service insurance far beyond what has existed hitherto. It protects the housewife, the widow and the orphan as well as the industrial, agricultural and white collar worker, the child and the aged. It will cover a much greater section of the population and the benefits are much larger than before. The suggestion of reciprocal arrangements between different countries is of special interest, and many other excellent features will repay study when the full text of the report reaches this country. Certain details, such as the proportions of premium paid by the state, the employer and the worker himself, the very low rate of old age pension for years to come, raise questions of importance, but these points must be left in abeyance for the present. Certainly, a social insurance scheme of this kind would be a vast improvement upon anything we have in Canada.

Social insurance is necessary, and will continue to be necessary, as it is necessary to care for the wounded on any battlefield. But he would be a poor general indeed who moved to the attack with no other plans in mind. The attempt being made in this country to represent the Beveridge report as the solution of our economic troubles does no service to Sir William, who was doing one definite job within definite limits which he himself clearly understood. Our old parties, on the other hand, will try hard to obscure them. They know only too well that the people will not go back to pre-war conditions; they hope that the people may be satisfied with some such scheme as this and, being given social insurance, will cease to clamour for social security in the real sense. In this sense the report may well become the price that Liberalism is willing to pay in order to avoid socialism. Let them pay the price by all means if they can. It is highly doubtful whether capitalism in depression could pay it, or anything like it.

Controversy on the Air

We agree with Mr. R. B. Tolbridge, whose article appears in this issue, that the CBC showed bad judgment in denying to Mr. Meighen the right to broadcast his address at Winnipeg. Mr. Meighen's valedictory after a long period of public service, and the convention itself, were of general interest. The CBC should have given him free time on the national network. Instead, it provided Mr. Meighen with an excuse for attacking the public broadcasting system on the score of partisanship, which may or may not have been a valid charge. Mr. Frank Chamberlain points out in *Saturday Night* that the CBC missed an excellent opportunity to do an "actuality" broadcast of the convention which would have enabled people all over Canada to come in touch with a phase of our political democracy that is hard to visualize through the cold type of a newspaper. Herein it neglected one of its important functions as a medium of communication.

The CBC's whole policy on "controversial" broadcasting, as Mr. Tolbridge suggests, requires overhauling. In wartime there is more need than ever for discussion of vital issues. Subject to "security" censorship, controversy over the air should be free and forthright, provided all sides are given a fair play. The farm and labor forums are an excellent start, but we should have more such, and adherence to the regulation that no speeches shall be broadcast from meetings without prior opportunity for censorship seems unreasonable where the speakers are responsible persons.

Education and the War

In the parleys that are going on between the government and university heads regarding the future of the liberal arts and social science courses in wartime it is to be hoped that the universities will make the issue as it affects our war effort perfectly clear. Such plans as those of the Canadian Legion for carrying education into the army camps cannot hope to go beyond the most elementary stages in any but strictly technical subjects. The only way to combine higher education and military training (if they must be combined) is at the university itself. And such education, which is essentially training for civic leadership, is especially needed in wartime. We should also be training teachers to carry on the work of those teachers who have gone to war; there aren't enough qualified oldsters to carry on this essential work unaided. Which suggests the query: What is to be done about those youths who abandoned their hopes of a university education when they took up arms for their country, and who, if they return, will have a special claim on Canada's ability to make good that loss. It will be to our interest to see they get all the education they can profit by. Universities and the state should both be preparing now to fulfil the obligation. Let it not be said of Canada that education was one of the casualties of this war.

Soldiers' Dependents Win

Yielding, it would seem, to the pressure of public opinion as voiced in the press and through veterans' and other organizations, the government has at last decided to grant the cost-of-living bonus to all service men's dependents, and to raise the scale of dependents' allowances to a point which is stated to be "the highest in the world." In addition, it has slightly increased the pay scale of the private soldier; and since the proportion of his pay which the soldier must "assign" to dependents remains the same, this will still further improve the income of the latter. The belated action will cost the nation \$35,000,000 annually. We have not been told yet where the money is to come from, but no one whose taxes may be affected will grudge the small additional burden. It has been one of the ironies of Canada's war effort that while organized drives were raising millions of dollars for deserving war victims abroad, the dependents of many of our own fighting men were scraping to keep the wolf from the door. All honor to those men who have persisted in their attempts to obtain a removal of this injustice. The announcement came on the last day of the three-week period within which the government had finally promised to reveal the result of its "study." A mass meeting in Toronto, called for the next day if the government failed to "come through," was accordingly cancelled.

Our New Format

With this issue, *The Canadian Forum* adopts certain changes in format. By employing a different and slightly more condensed type-face and reducing the width of its margins, it is able to give its readers the same amount of reading matter in twenty-four pages as it formerly gave them in thirty-two, and to co-operate with the Administrator of Printing and Publishing for the Wartime Prices and Trade Board in his appeal for conservation of paper stock. Further economies in space and cost have been effected by using only single-column headings and doing without color on the front cover. Combination of the new type-face with a heavier, non-surfaced paper has, we believe, resulted in no loss of legibility, and has even added to the general attractiveness of our appearance. We trust that our readers will find it so.

THE PRO AND CON PARTY

An Editorial

►SO THE old lady has gone and had her face lifted again!

The Canadian Tory party changes its name as often and as easily as the Canadian Communist party changes its line. Plus ça change . . .

They began it when the much-contriving John A. Macdonald launched the so-called Liberal-Conservative party in 1854. He chose the double-barreled name in order to insinuate into the public mind the idea that his new combination was sloughing off its old high-tory reactionary elements. And those dear, simple-minded souls, the historians of Canada, have enshrined as an established fact in our history books his claim that his party was a coalition of all the "moderates" to deliver the country from the violent contests of the extremists—although this moderate party contained all the old Family Compact extremists, and, as time was to show, it also contained the clerical ultramontane extremists of Quebec. In reality, Macdonald's Liberal-Conservative party was the party of big business plus the French Catholic church. It gave successful leadership for a generation, and built up a nation extending from sea to sea which was run by big business primarily in the interests of big business. Laurier's Liberal party took over this function in 1896.

The Tories came back to power in 1911 by a cynical and shameless exploitation of the most fervent British imperialist sentiment in English-speaking Canada and the most violent anti-imperialist sentiment in Quebec. (One of Borden's Quebec ministers after 1911 was a gentleman who on the hustings had expressed his desire to shoot holes through the union jack in order that the breeze of liberty might blow through it.) In 1921, having alienated practically every group in the community except the greediest of war profiteers, the party went down to disastrous defeat. It was on this occasion that it first tried to repeat what it imagined had been John A's formula for success. It appealed to the country as the National-Liberal-Conservative party. This was under the late Mr. Meighen, and the incident was the only one in which his statesmanship ever showed any similarity to that of John A. Macdonald. By 1930 it was the good old Tory party again. But in 1940 it was the National Government party—for the duration of the election campaign. And now it is the Progressive-Conservative party. Would one be putting it too strongly if one suggested that this repetitious technique shows a certain lack of creative imagination?

Of course the party managers are operating on Barnum's principle that there is one born every minute. They calculate that the ordinary voter is dull-witted enough to be taken in by a showy name, and since in this war for democracy everybody must profess himself forward-looking, they present themselves as progressives. But they are trying to put over a fake. Nothing shows this more clearly than the fact that at the Winnipeg convention every candidate for the party leadership came from west of the great lakes, though the voting power of the party is almost entirely in the east. There wasn't a single eastern candidate who could be produced with any likelihood of impressing himself on even the most gullible as a progressive. The candidate they chose is a farmer leader, while the voting strength in the east is largely urban, lower middle-class—the social group in the community from which have come all the reactionary and counter-revolutionary movements of our time. Most important of all, the people who supply the campaign funds for the party are neither westerners, nor farmers, nor industrial

workers, nor progressives. But it is they who will really determine the policy of the party.

Mr. Bracken is a fine fellow. He has been the best prime minister that any province has had during the last ten or fifteen years—though, God knows, to say this is not to pay him much of a compliment. The far-seeing nationalist program which he presented to the Rowell Commission and his vigorous efforts to have the report of the Commission adopted as national policy, as well as his long campaign in the interests of western agriculture against that low machine politician, Jimmy Gardiner, stamp him as having the qualities that are needed in our national public life. Anyone who ever watched him in the old days skipping his curling rink in a close match would know that he is the sort of man who is at his best when the going is hardest. But he has never had any connection with his present party. And the men who put him in his present job did so for the sole reason that he was the only leader they could think of who had a chance of defeating Mr. King. They picked him out to beat King, not to introduce a progressive government.

There are three great issues facing Canada at present. The manner in which we deal with them in our war effort and in our post-war reconstruction will determine whether we are to be a progressive national community or not. They provide the acid tests of the claims of any party to be progressive. It is not necessary to read party manifestoes or platforms. Just watch how a party reacts to these tests.

The first is the question of the place and function of the plain, ordinary man in our society. We all agree verbally that any tolerable post-war society must provide security for him—steady employment; minimum standards of housing, health, nutrition; equal opportunities for education. Genuine progressives add that he must be given a real share in the making of the communal decisions which affect his daily life, decisions about labor conditions and remuneration, about how the community services, of which he is the consumer, shall be carried on, all those decisions for which his right to vote in general elections seems so inadequate. Our wartime society is maintaining a high level of employment, but it is not giving the ordinary citizen any real share in making policy at all. All practical experience shows, and the conclusion is buttressed by the theoretical analysis of economists, that post-war society, if it is to maintain a high level of employment and production so as to make possible a high level of social services, must be one in which government planning and control of the economy have replaced the old system of private capitalist enterprise. Our Canadian Conservatives and Liberals profess to agree with the end, but they refuse to accept the means; they are all for preserving the noble system of private enterprise. They will fight in the last ditch for "freedom," meaning the freedom of business men to get rich in the way they see fit, freedom of business from government regulation and taxation. It ought to be clear enough by this time that free business enterprise cannot produce security, and cannot even produce steady prosperity, but only violent alternations of boom and depression. And the record of our big business men in running industry during this war or in running the dollar-a-year jobs at Ottawa shows what they really think of giving the common man a voice in policy. Neither the Conservatives nor the Liberals can meet this first test of progressivism.

It is true that in Britain the shock of war has shaken many a tory out of his old beliefs in nineteenth-century capitalism. But if one examines the transformation in beliefs which is going on there one will find that most of the leaders of the new-school tories are aristocrats, or intellectuals, or scientists, or churchmen. They are not business men. There are no aristocrats in Canada; and, while our

acquaintance may be limited, we have never discerned in Canadian Toryism any elements which struck us as being distinctly intellectual or scientific or Christian. Our less intelligent business men want "no government in business" after the war. Our more intelligent ones are coming to see that what they should really aim at is a paternal government controlled by business.

The second great issue is that of Canada's relations to Great Britain. Everyone agrees verbally that, if this war is not to be fought in vain, it must end in some world settlement which makes future wars impossible and which produces conditions under which democratic institutions can flourish everywhere. What we want is a United Nations world that stands for peace and democracy. Within the United Nations the chief obstacle to the realization of such ideals comes from two sources. First, there are the British Empire isolationists who are fighting for a restored and strengthened Empire and for nothing else. Second, there are the "American Century" isolationists who are dreaming of a great American imperialism. Each of these groups has considerable hope of using the other for its own purposes. Each of them hates Russia, and distrusts a revived China. Our Canadian Tories are instinctively British Empire isolationists. They have never been anything else. They disliked the League of Nations before the war, they denounce criticism of British policy in India by "outsiders" today. They are bitterly opposed to every step which might enable Canada to consider these questions of peace and democracy from a Canadian point of view. Most of them regret what Sir Robert Borden accomplished towards Canadian autonomy in the last war. They are pure colonials, and their colonialism always at a critical moment gets the better of their interest in broader issues.

The third great issue is that of the relationship of the French and English inside Canada. We may as well admit that that relationship had never been and is not likely to be for a long time very cordial. But the two races have to live together in some reasonable kind of collaboration. In the past this collaboration politically has always taken form in the leadership of some one political party. Under Baldwin and Lafontaine the two races worked together in the Reform party. Under Macdonald and Cartier they worked together for a generation in the Conservative party, and then under Laurier in the Liberal party. In our own day they worked together not too badly for twenty years in the Liberal party again under Messrs. King and Lapointe. All these parties were in reality rather loose coalitions of racial groups, each group leaving its partner fairly free to do as it pleased in its own local sphere.

It is to be noted that for a long time, since 1896, this racial collaboration has not been possible under tory auspices. And, of course, since the events of 1917, followed by the troubles of the present war, it is more than ever impossible now. Since Mr. Lapointe's death the Liberal form of collaboration is disintegrating, though this Liberal phase lasted longer than any other in our history. When Mr. King goes it will disintegrate altogether; and, incidentally, we shall then realize what a really big man Mr. King was, when we see the pigmies who succeed him in the Liberal party trying to deal with this most delicate and difficult of all Canadian problems.

Can the two races find a new political form of collaboration? There is only one possibility. Like the English-Canadian members of the CCF, the masses of the French-Canadians are coming to realize the extent to which they are exploited by economic monopolies, and they have lost faith in nineteenth century capitalism. But, whatever polite

palaver our English-Canadian Tories may adopt, they cannot work with the French. Their Toronto instincts of racial domination will always get the better of them in times of strain, just as their colonial instincts always get the better of them in times of strain when they face international questions.

No, the best that can be expected from the old dame, in spite of the skill with which this last face-lifting operation was done, is that she will be a pro and con party. On each of these three great test issues for progressives she may manage to be verbally pro, but her actions will certainly show her to be con.

STEVEN CARTWRIGHT—1908-1942

Lionel Gelber

► WHEN Pilot-Officer Steven Cartwright crashed to his death in air operations overseas, this country lost one of the most promising of its younger men. For among his fellows, Steven Cartwright always stood out as a natural leader. He had that quality of character which drew people to him in moments of perplexity as much as in hours of gladness; behind his shy, diffident charm lay an intelligence of breadth, cultivation and discernment. The affection he evoked unfailingly ripened into a deeper confidence. Across the ocean in Britain, to the south in the United States and everywhere in Canada there is a host of friends who share the sorrow of his mother, father and sister and by whom he will be greatly missed.

Into his thirty-four years Steven Cartwright crowded a rich variety of accomplishments. At Trinity College School he had been Head Boy. At the University of Toronto (Trinity College) his aptitude on the rugby field and as an oarsman, his capacity as a student and his popularity among his contemporaries were crowned with a Rhodes Scholarship. Into the stately world of Christ Church at Oxford (1929-32) he brought the fresh unaffected airs of his native Canada. Those who were with him there will recall the zest with which he threw himself into work and games and European travel without ever forgetting the North American society to which he belonged and would soon return.

Back in Canada once more, he was private secretary to the Rt. Hon. Vincent Massey and then became Editor of the *Canadian Forum*. Under him its policy was a progressive one but independent of party ties. Its standards he ably maintained. *Current History* in New York claimed him next and he rose on its staff to the rank of Managing Editor. Detecting considerable possibilities in facsimile radio he endeavoured finally to introduce it into Canada. Those who heard his broadcasts, read his articles or examined his booklet, *Population: Canada's Problem*, will remember the lucidity of his pen and the vivacity of his mind.

Well-informed and widely-travelled, he could hardly fail to see war coming or to realize what it might mean. To service as a writer and commentator he refused to be reconciled. He had not modelled himself upon the notable military pattern of his family. But his own principles and the current of events gave him no choice.

The R.C.A.F. took him. At his age and with his experience he might have had activities less perilous than those he embraced. Nothing was more typical of him than this last chapter of his career. He qualified as a navigator with the highest distinction and at no time had he been as content. For he knew what he was doing and why he was doing it. And it was in that spirit that he met his end.

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY

L. A. Mackay

► "FREEDOM and authority, once incompatible ideals, he was able to reconcile." This eulogy of a statesman long since dead sums up briefly the perpetual and peculiar problem of constitutional government. It is a problem that has to be faced anew in every generation, sometimes more than once in a generation. It is impossible to hope that in a ceaselessly changing world any permanent solution can be found; if a country is to escape anarchy or despotism, it must, as conditions change, adapt its institutions to be approximately adequate for the time being. There is abundant evidence that many serious thinkers regard the current Canadian solution as much too far from adequate.

It may be surmised that any party, enjoying an overwhelming majority in the House, and faced with the necessity for prompt and often secret decisions of great urgency, would have been tempted to slip into the rubber-stamp treatment of Parliament with which the present Government has been not unjustly reproached. Yet however understandable such action may be, it constitutes a precedent which becomes more and more ominous as the government moves or is driven into more intimate control of the nation's economic life. The average member's dependence on party organization has already made Parliament's control of the executive a little unsure. The entrance of the Government more and more into direct relations with the nation's business saps the very foundation of Parliament's historic method of controlling the executive, the voting of supply. At the present rate, it will soon be a matter of comparative indifference to the key ministries, whether the Estimates are ever presented or not. Also, it becomes increasingly evident that the older parties and the CCF are likely after the war to differ less about the amount of government control than about the way in which, and the group in whose interest, such control shall be utilized.

Since the rise of Nazi Germany it is no longer necessary to argue that political power, the control of organized force, is not the same as economic power. In snug and stable communities, economic power can and largely does determine political power. But in any serious and prolonged crisis, it has always been political power, the control of organized force, that has determined in whose hands economic power shall lie. There comes a time, in short, when the plain fighting man sees no reason to be content with wages when he can with comparative impunity appropriate capital. We shall get nowhere but into chaos, if we simply monkey about with economic controls and disregard political realities. Economic controls are important, but basic to these is the assurance that the ultimate control of organized force shall rest unmistakably with the people as a whole. Only so can economic reform take a peaceful course. Only so in time of crisis can revolutions be averted and counter-revolutions stifled at birth. Canada is not immediately threatened with either, but the time to provide pumps, pails, and hose, is before the fire breaks out.

Authority has increased, and seems likely to go on increasing, at the expense of freedom, and it is not easy to see what check can provide a proper balance. The party system aimed at, and often did in rough fashion achieve, a balance; but the party system depends for its effectiveness on the proper functioning of Parliament, and it is just the proper functioning of Parliament that becomes more difficult as more and more of the country's life comes directly under the control of boards of government experts. The party

system does make vigorous and coherent policy possible without completely silencing the claims of an alternative policy, yet it tightens the bonds of discipline that keep the private member listening for the word from above rather than from below. The party system is a practical device for achieving adequate authority in free institutions; what we need now is some device to ensure adequate freedom under authoritative institutions.

The device of a Second Chamber is intended to counter in some measure the dangers that arise when drastic changes of policy may depend on a bare majority, even in some cases an actual minority of the total vote cast. To that extent, a Second Chamber may serve to safeguard the free will of the whole people against the authority of a clique. In experience, Second Chambers have been in general the guardians of some vested interest, whether the interests of a caste, a class, or of individual states in a federation. That the members of such a chamber, unless themselves elected by popular vote, should exercise a veto over the elected representatives of the people, seems obviously incompatible with the full development of free institutions. But if they have no such vote, or if they too are elected, they seem to be merely redundant. The body politic becomes a freak, like a two-headed calf. The way is open to confusion, irresponsibility, and selfish manoeuvring in both Houses.

It has been suggested that the Second Chamber might serve as a pre-considering body, to examine the implications of new legislation, and to clear up ambiguities in its wording. Against this it has been urged that the technical aspect of such work can be more cheaply and expeditiously handled by a special committee of the Lower House; while if the Upper House, like the Lower House, is elected, it will add no new viewpoint; if it is nominated or hereditary, it will tend to consider new legislation primarily, if not exclusively, in reference to whatever special interests it represents.

A Senate appointed as is the Canadian Senate escapes some of the drawbacks of the simply elected, or irresponsibly nominated types; but unfortunately it represents not only the accumulated wisdom and practical experience, but also the accumulated prejudices and the accumulated senility of the country. Its composition corresponds neither to contemporary opinion in the country as a whole, nor to the party in power. It reflects the residue of elections long past.

It may be taken for granted that if government is to be both free and effective, the final handling of affairs must lie with the majority of the elected representatives of the people. But only the most naive will suppose that in any constitution yet devised, such a majority invariably represents the real will of the people as a whole. Hence all the apparatus of second chambers, division of powers, plebiscites, proposals of electoral reforms, and so on.

No single chamber has yet been devised which will at the same time be a faithful mirror of popular opinion, and provide a vigorous and consistent administration. Is it possible to devise a second chamber that will have definite and important functions, that will be no less representative of public opinion, but will not be a mere reflection of the elected house? It is possible; but only if we are willing to be a democratic country, more democratic than any in the world today. Second chambers have always been appointed on an aristocratic basis—even election is basically an aristocratic, not a democratic method of choice. We can, if we choose, initiate the first genuinely democratic Second Chamber, and therein by far the most genuinely democratic institution of government in the modern world. What I am going to say will seem fantastic or frivolous to a casual

glance, or to a mind closed by habit or by preconceived theories. I ask only that it be judged after fair consideration, on a basis of simple common sense.

The answer we seek lies alike in one of our oldest, and in one of our newest methods of securing the verdict of public opinion, in a principle, that is to say, which has stayed with us through the whole of our political development, and reappears in today's conditions with new vigor and importance: the principle of the jury, and of the Gallup poll. We must turn our Senate into a Council drawn by lot from the whole body of adult citizens, or perhaps from all over a certain age—say the age of thirty. Service must be compulsory, with reasonable indemnity, but with no class exempt, and individual exemptions granted only for the gravest reasons. A term should be three years, with one third of the number retiring each year, and no one eligible for reappointment at any time. Qualifications should be simple: excluding criminals and madmen, any man or woman should be eligible who has at least such knowledge of the French or English language, and of Canadian institutions, as would be required to pass the final examination in the Public Schools of his province, or their equivalent. Lots should be drawn from the whole voters' list, or if this is too unwieldy, from not more than ten equal groups, which groups should not correspond to any geographical, racial, or occupational divisions.

The new Senate would have to be considerably larger than the old—at least three times as large. It must be large enough to reflect roughly the varieties of popular opinion, but not large enough to provide what a poll expert would regard as a reliable sample. It is meant to be a check and a guide to the elected assembly (which could perhaps be profitably reduced in numbers), not a substitute for it, nor an overruling power. All new legislation, between its first and its final reading in the House of Commons, would be required to undergo the scrutiny of this body. The House of Commons would have the right to overrule, and would not hesitate to overrule, a close decision in the Senate; it would be very cautious, and rightly cautious, about committing itself to a policy which the Senate decisively rejected. Being constantly kept up-to-date, representing not local constituencies, but the country at large, and composed of men who have made no election promises, and have no hope of reappointment, such a Senate would mirror the public mind with as little distortion as any small assembly can hope to achieve. More promptly and impartially than any official or unofficial institution now at our disposal, it would give the legislator some indication how far the public is ready to approve a given measure. *Some* indication, but not a forecast reliable enough to impair the freedom or responsibility of the elected House, which must still initiate and shape policy.

To such an assembly, legislation would have to be presented or explained in language comprehensive to the average man, and criticism would be more likely to reflect the various interests of the country as a whole, not of any class, group, or party. Finally, and perhaps most important of all, the political life of the general public would be enriched by a steady stream of men and women who have had direct personal contact with the problems of government, while throughout the rest of the public, the prospect of being at any time called on to render such service may reasonably be expected to engender more serious and sustained interest in public affairs. Not many outstanding but unsuspected political talents would be brought to light; but that does not matter. Far more important is the widespread educative effect of the period of national service and the sense of personal responsibility awakened by its prospect.

In theory, many of these results might be achieved by a free use of plebiscites, or public opinion polls, or both; but these expedients are open to much more serious practical objections. The plebiscite suffers from the disadvantages of tardiness, expense, the difficulty of framing, for the whole electorate, questions which can usefully be answered by a plain "Yes" or "No," the impossibility of amendment by discussion among those consulted, and the danger of rendering the elected body incapable of responsible deliberation and decisive action. Privately managed public opinion polls are beginning to play an ever more important part in the development and marshalling of public opinion, and obviously by the mere framing and timing of questions they are open to no end of manipulation by private interests. Yet if the government were to take them over as they stand, that must result either in a paralysis of the elected body or in something not unlike Hitler's plebiscites. The popularity of polls, and the occasional resort to plebiscites, suggest that the elected bodies are recognized to be inadequately representative of popular opinion. The lot-chosen Senate would domesticate this development, and assimilate its valuable features into the recognized machinery of government, without removing from the elected body the ultimate responsibility for legislation and administration.

The proposal must commend itself, if it does commend itself, on the basis of our own time and our own needs; but it is only fair to add that it is no novel or untried expedient. It has behind it a record of several centuries' successful operation in Athens and other Greek democracies. The existence of such a council was in fact regarded as an unmistakable hallmark of democratic institutions. Nor dare we say, as could be said in the nineteenth century, that the experience of a Greek city-state is not applicable to a modern nation-state. Thanks to the press, the radio, and the movies, the modern citizen can be, and in a democratic country probably is, much better informed about the problems of the state than was the average Athenian. The Athenian had no newscast, no newspaper, no news reel. If he wished to know even the policy of his leaders, he did not turn on the radio, or open a newspaper at some convenient hour, in his own home, in circumstances reasonably conducive to critical attention. He had to drop work for a half-day or a day, walk perhaps a score of miles, and stand with several thousand others in an open-air mass meeting, straining to catch what he could of a speech delivered by the unaided human voice, and seldom preserved in any public record. Yet with all these disadvantages, those men were willing to trust the good sense of their people. They knew what they meant by democracy, and they were not afraid to try it. They meant "ruling and being ruled in turn." They meant that while the information and direction of policy was in the hands of the people's elected representatives, there remained in the very heart of the government a criticising and supervising body, immune from any trickery of elections, or hazard of brief popular fashion, owing its authority simply to this: that it was a cross-section of the nation itself, a body in which every Athenian of sound mind and good character might hope, once and once only in his life, to serve his country by taking a personal share in her government.

Dare we be as democratic as that? Dare we be the first to step into a fuller, more responsible democracy than any modern nation has yet attempted? There will be plenty more to do. Such a Senate will not cure all our ills. It will have its full complement of fools, honest and dishonest, like the country as a whole; but like the country as a whole it will have a solid and dominant mass of men of normal

good sense and normal good will, a steady bulwark of the people's freedom against all governmental encroachments and all special interests. It comes down to this: we, who claim to believe in democracy, are we willing to believe that the average Canadian can be trusted with such responsibility? Do we believe in freedom honestly enough and deeply enough to share it, and to trust it? If not, we shall deserve to lose it. And we shall lose it.

As Streams Turn Langourously

As streams turn langourously down in the south
so my body, moving in repose, considers you . . .
As flowing rivers swell to the mouth,
so I, murmuring of you in all my curves,
am now perfected, of the sea . . .
As the waters of the earth are lifted to the sun,
I, prone to lie upon the yielding lawn of life,
ascend to you,
as if a chosen element indigenous to you.

Your love and mine in strong and formal motion rises up
in use
to strive and grow to classic scientific structure.
We here reciprocate and here renew all good and rugged
satisfactions.

Carol Ely Harper.

Art

The tutored lightness of your lips
is like
the sound of temple bells heard
through a slowly opening door;
the widening ripple of enchantment
bends
beneath the baton of your fingertips,
in tempo like
the curving winged crescendo of sweet violins;
with symphonic flection, the discerning
and diphthongal articulation
of our limbs,
the weaving counterpoint comes to its climax:
mad white notes crash through the spectrum scale,
attain completion
in one stunning, cataclysmic and apocalyptic chord.
This is perfection;
this is the ultimate of endeavour, the end of art;
this is eclipsed by nothing
save
the stilled and sudden silence
afterwards.

Rita Smith.

Sky

Hills' long outstretching arms present the sky
where the unrisen sun makes red gestures . . .
Our small-eyed houses turn their backs and hunch down
like wise monkeys.
We come from their black interiors
and walk in the sky, rose-madder.
On our eyes sits the red joy,
and we are tall.
Then it is over.
and clouds receive
the sun.

Ann Bernard.

DEMOCRATIC DEFEAT

Morley Ayearst

► MANY people in the United States and elsewhere were astonished at the results of the November elections. Even the Republican machine politicians, professional optimists though they be, could hardly conceal their surprise at the size of their victory. Instead of having easy domination in the House, the Democrats are left with a dangerously small majority. In the Senate, where, of course, only about a third of the seats were in dispute, the Democratic loss was less serious. The swing to the Republicans was nation-wide. Even where Democrats retained their seats they did so by sharply reduced pluralities in many cases.

What does it all mean? Can it possibly mean that the United States is becoming defeatist about the war? Not even the Nazi propagandists have made this claim so far. In any case it is obviously not the explanation. War-weariness has not touched the American people. In the mass they have hardly yet begun to have their lives affected seriously by the war effort except for the war boom. The re-election of such notorious anti-preparedness isolationists as Hamilton Fish in New York and Clare Hoffman in Michigan might appear to indicate some anti-war feeling, at least among the voters who elected them. However, the explanation in such cases would seem to be the existence of a strong personal machine and much anti-Roosevelt sentiment in their districts. Fish, for instance, is now loudly patriotic. He made a very active hand-shaking campaign, bewailing the "smear" tactics of his opponents. Despite the fact that he was repudiated by his own party leaders he won, though by a narrow margin. Most of the successful Republican candidates were not at all of the Fish persuasion, but vociferously championed a more vigorous war policy. Few attacked the President directly but rather concentrated on the need to get tough and stop fighting a soft war. Upon analysis, this would seem to mean that they want most of the New Deal policies, especially the Wagner Act, scrapped.

Was the election result then a plain repudiation of the New Deal and its works? It was not as simple as that. There can be no doubt that several factors combined to militate against Democratic victories and help Republicans, but the exact weight to be attributed to each factor must remain largely a matter of opinion. In the first place this was an off-year election; that is, one in which there was no presidential campaign. Now, in the American system, the President is the only nationally elected official. All others, in greater or lesser degree, regard themselves and are regarded by the voters as local representatives, first and foremost. They are in Washington, it is felt, chiefly to protect the interests of their state and district. Consequently in an off-year election, local affairs may play a dominating part in the results and cut across national issues. This is especially the case if there is no very important national issue to the fore. There was none this time. Everybody talked about winning the war. The nearest approach to an issue was the Republican claim, mentioned above, that the war administration is inefficient, bureaucratic and soft. It is impossible to say whether or not this argument pulled many votes into the Republican column. The slim numbers and general apathy of the city crowds on election night gave clear evidence that this election had failed to arouse strong emotions one way or the other. To New York newspapermen the indifferent throng in Times Square recalled another election night, twenty-four years ago, when Woodrow Wilson lost control of his Congress.

Vice-President Wallace attributes the result to the small vote of an off-year election. This means, he says, a larger proportion of well-to-do voters. Arthur Krock made a good deal of fun of him for this statement. Whether this claim has any merit or not, it is true that a light vote was cast. Mr. Wallace noted the error of the Gallup poll which forecast a virtually unchanged Democratic majority. This prediction, he said, was based on an expected vote of about 30,000,000. Actually only about 26,000,000 votes were cast. There can be no doubt also that labor failed to give mass support to the Democrats. Prosperity breeds political indifference and even conservatism. Many factory workers had lately shifted residence and would not take the trouble to apply for an absentee ballot. Many more simply did not bother to vote. Hence, in part, the light city balloting and the corresponding Republican gains. The old adage about Republicans bringing good times is true in reverse. Good times strengthen conservative sentiment and also mean light voting. A light vote means increased machine strength. Although there are more registered Democrats than Republicans in the entire country, the former are highly concentrated in the Solid South and a few big cities. The Republican machine strength is far more evenly distributed and this means many fewer wasted votes under the single member district system.

The Vice-President also referred to the absence of many young men who are now in the armed forces. A few of those in the camps used absentee ballots. Those already overseas were disfranchised. It is very doubtful, however, if this was an important factor in the total result. These absences are well scattered over the whole country and there would seldom be enough votes involved in any one district to change the election.

Another by-product of the off-year election was the upsurge of local issues and personalities. As it happened, these aided the Republicans in nearly every case. The most notorious of these was doubtless the Roosevelt-Farley feud in New York. The large vote obtained by the American Labor Party candidate, Alfange, and the fact that Lieutenant-Governor Poletti who had both New Deal and machine support came within a hairbreadth of winning, is evidence that Dewey's emphatic victory was due more to this Democratic split than to his own political attraction. Again, in Connecticut there can be little doubt that the incumbent Democratic Governor Hurley would have been re-elected had the so-called Socialist mayor of Bridgeport not chosen to inject his candidacy. Mayor McLevy has a very strong personal following in his own city and virtually every vote he gets is taken from the Democratic strength. It is said that he receives campaign funds from Republican sources. This is actually the second time that he has pulled enough votes to assure the election of a Republican governor.

The most astonishing upset of the entire campaign was that of the grand old liberal Senator Norris of Nebraska. After an unbroken record of forty years of legislative service he was repudiated by his people. Many circumstances conspired against him. Many of his friends did not expect him to run again. Some thought he ought to retire because of his age. He is in his eighties. His decision to run came so late in the day that the Democratic machine was already firmly committed to the support of one Foster May, a radio announcer whose dulcet tones had charmed the farmers' wives. Norris did not campaign until the very eve of the election and then it was a half-hearted performance. Nebraska voters appear to have been disgruntled with war restrictions. The farmers were turning against the New Deal. Even so, Norris was defeated only by the combined Democratic and Republican vote. Had he received the

Democratic support which should have been his, he would have been returned to the Senate.

The Republican explanation of victory naturally contains no reference to the light vote and local cross currents of an off-year election. It is simply this: Republican success is a public judgment upon New Dealism and the bureaucratic incompetence of Washington. That there exists widespread irritation at alleged administrative mismanagement of the war effort cannot be denied. Some of the criticism of Washington has been deserved; some it should rather have been directed at those private individuals who have placed their own interests above those of the nation. In any case, the President and his supporters in Congress have had to bear the responsibility for the misdeeds, real or fancied, of the many administrative agencies. Even unavoidable wartime restrictions such as the rationing of gasoline and tires have helped, in Raymond Clapper's opinion, in some degree to swell the Republican total.

Probably the most important factor of all, along with general indifference, was the loss by the Democratic party of a good deal of its farm support. Because of the relative over-representation of rural areas, the farm vote carries more than its numerical weight in elections to the House of Representatives. At one time the farmers were pretty solidly pro-Roosevelt. His administration had given them precisely what they had asked for. But now they are soured on the New Deal. They resent the President's attitude on farm parities, and they are especially resentful of what they consider his favoritism toward union labor. This attitude toward labor would appear to be particularly significant. The draft was applied to farmers and their sons and hired men in the beginning with little attention paid to the possible effect on farm production. This, together with the lure of big factory wages, has produced a national shortage of farm labor. The farmers are especially bitter about the rapid rise of wages in industry. They feel that this leaves them, as usual, enjoying less than a fair share of the national income. They hate and fear organized labor and they blame the President for encouraging its growth. Insofar as the farm population is concerned therefore, there is truth in the Republican claim that people have turned against the New Deal. Of course not all farmers have repudiated the President's leadership but as a class they are no longer solidly behind him.

What may be expected of the new Congress with its revitalized Republican opposition? Already Senator Vandenberg of Michigan is calling for a win-the-war coalition under an agreement to shelve the New Deal for the duration. If no serious rifts develop between the Willkie Republicans and their rivals, they can upset the President's program whenever they can secure the aid of a handful of anti-New Deal Democrats. This may very well happen. At the worst it can mean a serious disruption of current labour and taxation policies with incalculable results.

Unfortunately too many voters and too many legislators of both parties have no conception of the real issues of this war. To them it is merely another international quarrel in which national honour must be defended and revenge taken for Pearl Harbour and ship sinking. The implications of the Atlantic Charter leave them indifferent. The Vice-President's speeches with their imaginative grasp of world politics seem to them the tall talk of a dreamer. The really dangerous result of this election is the success of far too many men whose policy is: forget all this nonsense about social reform and concentrate on licking the Japs and Nazis. The end result of that kind of thinking is another Harding in the White House and the overturn not only of the New Deal but a revival of isolationism after the war.

Surely, one may say, the American people can't be as stupid as that twice in one generation. They can if they allow elections to go by default as they did in 1942.

Postscript:

In a letter to the New York Times which appeared in the issue of November 13, Dr. Gallup gives his own explanation as to why his election prediction went astray. It supports the thesis of this article, that non-voting was the chief factor in the Democratic defeat. His forecast was that the Republicans would receive 48% of the vote whereas they actually got 52.5%. Gallup's average error on election results has been 3%. This time it was 4.5%. This prediction was based upon a study of the shift of voters from one party to another, and by projections from the results of previous off-year elections. Gallup's researches indicated that any shift to the Republicans in the last two years had been counterbalanced by a shift of as many other persons to the Democratic ranks. A normal amount of non-voting was allowed for, but not the amount that actually occurred. The election result therefore is to be explained not by any serious shift in party allegiance but by the non-voting of five million younger men in the army and navy, another five to ten million workers who lost their votes through change of residence, and an additional ten million or so citizens who simply neglected to vote. The proof of this statement is to be found in the fact that in areas of the heaviest voting, outside of the Solid South, Republicans made the smallest gains, whereas in other places where the vote was particularly light they made their greatest gains.

"One look at the election figures will show any one that the dominant factor in this election was not protest . . . but lack of interest."

CBC AND THE GOVERNMENT

R. B. Tolbridge

► PREVIOUS articles in this series based on the parliamentary enquiry into the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation have dealt in the main with the relation of the CBC to private broadcasting. This article will deal with the relation of the CBC to the government.

This relationship may be considered with respect either to theory or to practice. People who admit that in *theory* the CBC is independent of the government may argue that there is, in fact, a pretty close tie-up. This view is not confined to political parties in opposition and inclined to blame the government for CBC policies they don't like, nor to private interests opposed to the principle of publicly controlled broadcasting. The ordinary citizen, impatient with legal hair-splitting, is prone to think of the CBC as a department of the government. And there are some grounds for this attitude in the statutory basis of the Corporation.

The government appoints the board of governors, its chairman and vice-chairman and the general manager and assistant general manager (the last two on recommendation of the board). Minutes of the board are filed with the Minister who is "spokesman" for the CBC in parliament, so that the board's policies may be discussed by the cabinet; and all accounts and records are available to the Minister, who may demand detailed financial reports at any time. All by-laws passed by the Corporation, moreover, must be approved by the governor in council before becoming effective. Certain limits are placed on the amounts of money which the Corporation may expend without specific approval of the governor in council.

What is to prevent the government from packing the board with its partisans? Or from intimating to its ap-

pointees that it would like certain policies reversed and certain others followed? Well, the answer is, of course: Nothing of a statutory nature.

Yet there is little doubt as to the *intention* of the framers of the Canadian Broadcasting Act. They gave the CBC wide powers, not only over its own but over *all* broadcasting in Canada, and considerable financial leeway. And they undoubtedly intended the Corporation to exercise these powers without interference from or influence by the government. Provision was made for an annual report to parliament through the appropriate cabinet minister, so that parliament (not the cabinet) might determine whether the public trust was being administered in the interests of the people. When parliament thinks it advisable, it appoints a committee to review more closely the administration of this trust.

And yet the constitutional position of the CBC presents certain puzzling uncertainties and inconsistencies. What kind of "corporation" is the CBC?

The Act does not give it a name, but merely says, in language reminiscent of the Book of Genesis: "There shall be a Corporation, to be known as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which shall consist of a board of nine governors appointed by the Governor in Council and chosen to give representation to the principal geographical divisions of Canada." Elsewhere, the Act says that "the Corporation shall be a body corporate having the capacity to contract and to sue and be sued in the name of the Corporation." It has been called a "public corporation", but this term has no exact meaning in law. It is not, it would seem, like many of the war industries in which the government owns a majority of the shares, a "Crown company". The CBC has no share capital. It has been likened to the Canadian National Railway set-up. But, as Mr. Thorson pointed out in cross-examination, while the fundamental principle is the same, there are important differences. The argument (favored by private broadcasting interests) that because the CNR has no power over the CPR, therefore the CBC should not have any power over the private radio stations, is answered by the Act itself. The Act *gives* it this power. Indeed, this was one of the primary reasons *for* the Act.

The term "emanation of the Crown", frequently used by witnesses, proved similarly inconclusive. Since the CBC was an "emanation of the Crown" it pays no taxes; yet it can be sued, and how can an "emanation of the Crown" be sued? It was said to be "independent" and "autonomous"; yet the Department of Justice, asked for an opinion as to whether the CBC could enter into collective agreements with its employees, said:

Your Corporation is, in many respects, in the position of a department of Government and I would not think that the Board of Governors or the General Manager would have the authority to enter into such an agreement which would restrict the authority of the Corporation to act as freely as the Government itself in all matters pertaining to its employees.

The nearest to a definition was that advanced by Hon. J. T. Thorson, then Minister of National War Services and parliamentary "spokesman" for the CBC. Said Mr. Thorson:

My position is that the statute is the governing document. It [the CBC] is a corporation. It has only the powers given to it by the statute . . . The corporation is subject to parliamentary review in accordance with the provisions of the statute, to that extent it is like a department [of the government] but apart from the statutory provisions, it is an independent corporation.

But in reply to Mr. Coldwell's question: "Is it in any sense a department of the government?" Mr. Thorson had already said: "I do not think it is in any sense a department of the government," thus making a distinction for laymen to puzzle over between *being* a department of government and *being like* a department of government!

In any event, following the "opinion" by the Department of Justice, Dr. Frigon, assistant general manager, proceeded

with the approval of the board to organize "staff councils". As a result, dealings with CBC employees are now carried out by the management through one of the most rigidly regimented "company" unions in Canada.

There had previously been a movement to organize CBC technical employees as a unit of the Association of Technical Employees, a union affiliated through the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress with the A. F. of L. But just as negotiations for a conciliation board were being opened in Ottawa, the negotiator for the employees was arrested and interned on charges under the Defence of Canada Regulations. Although Dr. Frigon admitted that the RCMP had been in communication with him about this man, and it was subsequently alleged by the union that rumors of its "subversiveness" had originated with a CBC official, there was, Dr. Frigon asserted, no connection between the union movement and the arrest. It was merely an unfortunate coincidence.

The following extracts from the memorandum issued to the staff by Dr. Frigon are enlightening:

In order to bring about the best possible relations between the personnel and the administration, it has been decided to invite all Corporation employees to appoint staff councils at each of the following points [the seven divisional centres]. These councils, through their elected officers, will represent the local staff and will take up with the local manager and where necessary with the general management, all matters pertaining to the local groups and individuals. . . . Once a year representatives of such councils will meet at a central point, at the expense of the Corporation, to discuss matters of general interest to the whole personnel throughout Canada. They will submit to the management any matter they may wish. . . . Of course, we will not tolerate that any individual through his action should interfere with the smooth conduct of this co-operative scheme; and I am sure that we will have no difficulty in this respect because I know that our personnel is composed of well-intentioned and faithful servants who will see to it that no trouble-maker jeopardizes their honest efforts to maintain the best of relations within the whole organization. . . . Although it is not the intention to force employees at each point to appoint a council, it is in the interest of the service to deal through the Executive of Staff Councils in all matters concerning the general interests of all employees.

The mandatory and cautionary tone of this "invitation" will appear to many to be less in keeping with Canadian democracy than with the totalitarianism of certain countries where labor is safely "regimented."

By way of contrast, it was pointed out by Mr. Coldwell that the BBC, upon which the CBC is supposed to have been modeled, is (in the words of Sir Walter Citrine) "a chartered corporation whose employees, like those in industry, are at liberty to join any appropriate union they desire."

Certain other matters beside unionization and collective bargaining are involved in the CBC's being "like" a government department yet *not* a government department—as, for example, capacity to come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, insurance, postage, relations with government departments—but this instance will suffice.

Nevertheless, while the CBC, according to the Department of Justice, is "in many respects in the position of a department of government" it cannot be questioned on the floor of parliament, except on certain specific occasions, because it is *not* a department of government. And what about post office employees, who are organized in a union?

However, despite the confusing legal position, the *attitude* of most of those concerned toward the CBC is what was evidently intended by the framers of the Act. The CBC is held to be "independent and autonomous", divorced from government authority, though limited in certain respects in its financial powers, and responsible only to parliament. Mr. Thorson, at least, was clear on this. He said:

The attitude I have always taken towards the CBC is that the statute governs, and in as far as the statute makes the CBC an independent corporation, so it shall be so far as I am concerned; and I shall not attempt to do anything . . . that will affect that independent position. My jurisdiction as Minister of National War

Services is found within the four corners of the statute and not otherwise. . . . I think it is essential that we should have as clear a conception of the CBC as possible. I have been somewhat amused at the views that have been taken by certain persons, including members of parliament, that one of my activities is to run the CBC. Not at all. It is not one of my activities. I am the minister responsible to parliament for certain specific matters, but only the matters that are set out in the governing statute of the CBC and not otherwise.

Mr. Morin, chairman of the board, while evidently recognizing the uncertain legal position, was similarly emphatic about what the relationship *should* be. He said:

The government of Canada simply acts as a collector of licence fees, which duly belong to us, once they have been paid by listeners as their contribution to our national broadcasting system. We therefore exist outside governmental operations and we think that it is better that we should thus remain; ours is a business, not a department.

While, therefore, the CBC is considered to be independent of government authority, there remains the question whether, in fact, it is.

The first board of governors, through its chairman, Mr. L. W. Brockington, was outspoken in its determination to keep the CBC outside the government sphere of influence, and at the end of his term, Mr. Brockington asserted that there had been no attempt by the government to bring political pressure. On the vexed questions of "controversial" broadcasts, the policy was to encourage frank and even (to use Mr. Brockington's word) "provocative" discussion on the air. A modus operandi was eventually worked out for party-political broadcasting, whereby free time on CBC networks was allotted in an agreed proportion to the various parties during national election contests, and ultimately this was to extend to provincial contests. The principle was adopted that purchase of network time for political broadcasting should be prohibited—quite rightly, since it would set up an invidious distinction between those who could raise the money and those who couldn't. This principle was extended to controversial broadcasting of a non-party character, and the refusal of time to Mr. George McCullagh, and the subsequent reversal of this decision by the general manager after war broke out, caused no end of a rumpus.

But the deterioration in internal management which eventually led to the resignation of a member of the board of governors and of two senior officials and to the parliamentary enquiry, brought with it, especially after the outbreak of war, developments which placed in grave question the actual relationship of the CBC to the government.

For a few weeks after the declaration of war, there were direct dealings, not between the board and the government, nor between the general manager and the government proper, but between the general manager and Mr. Howe, in what appear to have been sometimes official, sometimes personal consultations, without any change in the statutory relationship, which is between the board of governors and the minister. There was, indeed, some talk of the government "taking over" the CBC, as the British Government had assumed control of all but the purely entertainment functions of the BBC. At Mr. Howe's request, a meeting of the board to discuss wartime policy, which had been called for September 9, was postponed indefinitely. For more than six weeks, the board, if not in theory, at least in practice, abdicated its functions. Mr. Murray's explanation was:

It might be argued that in practice, for a few weeks after the impact of war, the management dealt directly with the government. . . . I kept in telephone consultation daily with the chairman of the board of governors, and tried to work it on that triangular basis. . . . Meanwhile there was constant communication on the one hand between me and the minister, and on the other between Mr. Brockington, Mr. Nathanson and Mr. Godfrey.

Mr. Murray's reasons for this procedure were that "in those early and very anxious days . . . we were all concerned more with getting things done from day to day than with

problems of correct constitutional procedure." But the result was that no clear-cut policy was laid down, either by the Board or the government, for the CBC in wartime.

Mr. Pickering, at that time assistant to the general manager, told the committee that he drafted a memorandum for Mr. Murray to present to the government suggesting that, if the government intended to effect any change in the relationship between the CBC and itself, this should be decided forthwith and brought about by proper constitutional methods. Mr. Murray took it to Mr. Howe personally the next morning because he wanted to "read it to Mr. Howe and get his views on it." There is no evidence that it went any further than Mr. Howe, who discussed it with Mr. Murray and said (Mr. Murray's words): "Well, we are in no position now to decide this. . . . We shall have to see how things develop and deal with the situations as they arise."

The board eventually met on October 16. No action was taken by the government to extend its authority over the CBC. But for a while it seems to have been "nip and tuck," and meanwhile the general manager dealt directly with the government, or at least with Mr. Howe. However, when the general manager issued an internal memorandum warning employees that the government would frown on any trade union activity, the Prime Minister immediately repudiated the memorandum and told the press that only the board of governors could decide CBC policy. So the puzzle of who was running the Corporation became more and more complicated. Mr. Murray said that Mr. Howe expressed no opinion about taking over the CBC, and as for Mr. Murray himself, "my own view very definitely was, and still is, that it has been of enormous advantage to Canada that the constitution [of the CBC] has been preserved." But Mr. Pickering got a different impression, as shown by his answer to a question by Mr. Coldwell:

MR. COLDWELL: The impression that this leaves with me . . . is this: that instead of the general manager guarding, shall I say, the rights of the Corporation under the Act . . . he was willing to forego those rights and to view with a good deal of satisfaction the placing of the corporation's business under the Minister rather than the board . . . Am I right in that impression?—MR. PICKERING: I would say that, to some extent, that was the impression I received.

At any rate, Mr. Murray made it clear that Mr. Pickering's views on "constitutionality" were not particularly welcome to him, and Mr. Pickering resigned on September 8.

But the board, although it resumed its functions on October 16, still refrained from laying down any definite policy on war broadcasting. The management continued to deal with individual government departments in a haphazard fashion, leaving it mostly to the Department of Public Information and outside organizations to provide material. To quote Mr. Donald Buchanan, at that time Supervisor of Talks Broadcasts:

Without new rules to replace those drawn up by the board in their published statement of July, 1939, on controversial broadcasting—the white pamphlet—the program department of the CBC was being forced to operate, during a complicated period, without any clear-cut and established directions from above . . . Through lack of established policy few wartime talks were being presented directly and definitely by the CBC itself on its own initiative, and of these few some were prompted by personal considerations and did not relate to any considered or well thought-out plan of war information.

As a result of the confusion in the Corporation caused by this lack of policy, Mr. Buchanan resigned in protest on November 23, 1940.

The CBC was becoming, through negligence of the board and unregulated action of its general manager, to all intents and purposes a department under the day-to-day control of Mr. Howe. Failure to deal constructively with "political" broadcasting was one concomitant. On January 22, 1940, the board seems to have considered curtailing its allotment of free network time to the parties, and banning of the purchase of time on any station for the duration. But protests

by the national secretaries of all the political parties, including the Liberal party, led it to abandon the first of these proposals. In other words, the Liberal party wouldn't accept the decision of the board, which had been, one would have supposed, already ratified by Mr. Howe, so all four national parties obtained free network time for the election. Further consideration (pressure from private stations was suggested by one committee member) led the board to permit the purchase of time by party broadcasters on private stations. No move was made to extend the principle of free network time to provincial elections.

Admittedly, the question of "political" broadcasting is a problem for radio. Nevertheless, the CBC has at best shown a vacillating and timid approach to it, and at worst has laid itself open to the suspicion of favoring the government of the day. It tended to believe, until the recommendations of the 1942 parliamentary committee proved it to be wrong, that "controversial" broadcasting should be abandoned in wartime. The result is that the government, which quite rightly makes use of the CBC network to announce and "explain" its policies, was left with a virtual monopoly of this important medium in the political field, except for such "round table" discussions as the farm and labor forums. Thus, we have such debated rulings as the refusal to permit Mr. Meighen to broadcast, even on a purchase basis, his "keynote" speech to the Conservative convention in Winnipeg. A party leader, even "on the way out," should have been given free time for this purpose. This might have seemed unfair to the CCF, which held a national convention in Toronto last summer at which Mr. Coldwell delivered an equally important "keynote" speech without benefit of the CBC. But we imagine that the CCF would be willing to overlook this inconsistency, provided they were granted a similar right at their next convention. The Liberal party, of course, does not hold conventions; but Mr. King and his ministers are making constant use of the CBC network, and have no ground for complaint. The ruling that "platform" speeches, not having been previously made amenable to censorship, cannot be broadcast, seems needlessly restrictive, and at any rate might have been relaxed in the case of responsible party leaders, who are not likely to violate DCR "security" principles.

What conclusion, then, must we come to regarding this important matter—the political independence of the CBC? It is simply that the onus rests squarely on the shoulders of the board of governors. It is, of course, the duty of the government which appoints the board to see that its appointments are appropriate and non-partisan, and (even more important than the regional distribution laid down in the Act) that they represent all the principal elements amongst our citizenry—including labor and agriculture. This last point was emphasized in the report of the parliamentary committee, as was the duty of the government to see that all vacancies on the board are filled promptly, and incapacitated members dispensed with. In these two respects, the present government has been delinquent.

In the past, the existing board of the CBC showed small sense of its responsibilities. It met seldom, and apparently gave little attention to the main business of a broadcasting authority, that is, programs. Its dereliction at the outbreak of war has been described. So grave were the criticisms of the parliamentary committee in its final report, however, it now seems likely that the board and the new general manager will take their responsibilities more seriously. Wartime relations with the government have now been put on a better footing through creation of the Department of Information and the appointment of a liaison officer between that body and the CBC.

TOBACCO

R. E. K. Pemberton

► BY FAR the most important fact about the Canadian tobacco industry is the dominant position occupied within it by the very few processing and manufacturing concerns. With Imperial at their head, these corporations lord it over grower, factory-worker, retailer and consumer. Everyone knows that monopoly in private hands is always and everywhere a curse to all but the monopolist; even the orthodox economists go as far as that, and that should be sufficient to form a basis for policy. Moreover, the facts of this exploitation were brought out with a wealth of detail and a nauseating comprehensiveness in the Price-Spreads Report. And subsequent official enquiries into separate phases of the situation have simply corroborated those results.

But certain infinitely less-important facts seem to be obscuring the vision of many who are seeking a way-out. Since 1934, for example, the growers, or most of them, have managed to organize, with the effect of mitigating the exploitation to a slight extent. All of these are conscious that conditions have not been quite as bad since they organized; and of them some might, perhaps, view with misgiving any proposal—such, for instance, as the CCF has made—to do over the present system of marketing. Would it be polite, would it even be good statesmanship, to propose a radical reorganization against the (assumed) wishes of one of the classes principally concerned, or even of a part of it?

Again, there is the question of the growers who are not, and never have been, members of the marketing board—among whom, I believe, is numbered no less a personage than P. M. Dewan. Apart from the fact that many of them would have been glad, but were not allowed, to join the board, there is also the fact that producers in a competitive economy, and fed upon a corresponding ideology, cannot properly be blamed for acting accordingly of their own choice. Nevertheless, some of the board-members—who form a large majority of all growers—probably regard them as scabs and speak of them as 'the blacklisted'. The black-listed growers, of course, unless in the rare case of the specially listed, invariably—in normal conditions—fare even worse than the board-members themselves.

Again, there is the problem of the co-operative that was formed in 1940 by certain discontented growers who resigned from the board. If to be on the blacklist is to be heathen or heretic, to have belonged to that co-op must be plain apostasy! 'Sock them!'—that is the attitude, perhaps, of some of the continuing board-members. What is much less uncertain, and far more significant, is this: every item of relevant evidence points to the conclusion that the buyers take this attitude, and have acted in pursuance of it. Monopoly does not like competition. And it would seem that monopoly is content with the operations of the board—which implies a very great deal.

Let us take these three points in turn.

As to the first, Mr. Archie Leitch, who ought to know, stated years ago that the (then) cost of producing flue-cured tobacco was 27 or 28 cents per pound, I forget which, and it does not matter. Not once has this tobacco marketing board, which is supposed to represent the interests of the growers, and over which Mr. Leitch presides so unswervingly—not once has it set a price as high as 27 cents. Only once—this year—has it set a price which could even appear to approach it. And this year the costs of production were so much higher than in any year since 1934 that this year's price will be shown in time to be one of the lowest

'real' prices that the growers have received in that period. This would be true even if all the growers were actually receiving 26¾ cents. And this is not prophecy, but certainty.

It is surely necessary to conclude that the board-members themselves, including those who feel a positive resentment against the independents, might well be susceptible to the very easy demonstration that they are themselves victims of a shameless exploitation. Even if it proved otherwise, the only possible policy for any people's party would be to insist on removing that exploitation regardless. The second point needs no elaboration. The blacklisted growers—many of whom, as aforesaid, are only such because they have no alternative except going out of the business—are always potentially and in general actually more exploited than the member-growers themselves. They need government intervention even more than the member-growers. Further, the cause of their distress is the same as that of the members; and the remedy for it will be the same—or none.

Lastly, what about the co-operative? Legally speaking, it may even have ceased to exist. Once again, I don't know; and once again it doesn't matter. Its members—or ex-members—sold their crops independently in 1941, and must be doing so, or trying to, this year also (those of them, that is, who have not been squeezed out altogether). On the other hand, the American sales-agent, whom the co-operative brought over in April, 1941, in the effort to dispose of its 1940 crop, is still residing at Tillsonburg. And—the only really important fact—the whole of this 1940 crop is still unsold. With excellent marketing conditions, every outlet has been found closed, except at a sacrifice-price. We can guess by whom, by what methods, with what aims . . .

So far from deserving any kind of adverse discrimination the co-op members should receive, if anything, the credit which properly belongs to those, always in a minority, who have the courage to make head against a sea of troubles, instead of accepting them. They are genuine producers, as genuinely and not less intelligently interested in the welfare of their industry than the board members themselves. And they are certainly in even greater need of assistance.

The co-operative's experience, by the way, added to many others', proves to satiety that co-operation, starting and operating in present conditions, is not a possible way-out. And so we return to the point at which we started. The sum and substance of what is essentially wrong with the tobacco-industry is the monopoly-power of the big processors and manufacturers. A very Juggernaut, it oppresses, in its progress from profit to greater profit, not only all but its few fifth-columnists among the growers, but, also, the much greater number of its own workers and the vastly greater number of consumers. It is the one point at which effective attack can be made upon the existing and long-standing injustice.

A real improvement could be made even by the provincial government. Not only could it guarantee the sale, at a fair price, of the tobacco held by the co-operative. It could at least offer to all growers a marketing-scheme under the Act of 1937. Several other bodies of producers—e.g., those of beets and tomatoes—have derived from such schemes more advantage than has accrued to the high majority of all tobacco-growers. But much more could and should be done. Even under this same Act, which need not set limits to the competence of a determined legislature, much more could be done than has ever been attempted. It could be done by any government which cared to do it, and was not afraid to promise it. A copy of the Act can be obtained free by anyone who is sufficiently interested to write for it.

January
The Editor
The Canadian
Quite a
hands, and
on Music
his which
"But t
(the only
Smattering
remarks a
Eviden
Sense," w
relationships
notes and
of Dovz
Russian
music rel
been prin
Frye is al
frequent An
Valley w
individual
sensitive
With s
will think
Mr. Frye
alone and
alone and
the beaut
music is c
composite
And in t
applied to
with sepa
"Still p
art than
picturesqu
subject, l
Frye I fe
"more de
dependen
the black
and what
very colo
very ordi
The v
seeing Fr
discussing
(I trie
the point
view it c
aspects o
is an ext
to a film
it adds u
result wa
took from
I do not
to paintin
use of a
knife in
Elaps' l
interesting
The Edit
The Cana
Is not
and susp
mentary
and allow
in this as
been der
to sugges
become "c
ment bus
to compo
(Mr. J
private in

CORRESPONDENCE

The Editor,
The Canadian Forum.

Quite by accident a copy of this month's Forum came into my hands, and I became annoyed when I read Northrop Frye's article on Music in the Movies. There are a few erroneous impressions of his which need clarifying.

"But the subject of music in the movies has been so little treated (the only good book on the subject I have seen is Oscar Levant's *Smattering of Ignorance*) that perhaps even vague and ill-documented remarks about it may have some point."

Evidently Mr. Frye is completely unaware of Eisenstein's "Film Sense," where a great portion of the book is devoted to the intricate relationship existing between the frames of a film sequence and the notes and chords of the music. Evidently Mr. Frye is also unaware of Dovzhenko and his *Film Technique* (the late edition). The Russian School of Cinematography has been experimenting with music related to film since its inception, and regular bulletins have been printed in several documentary film magazines. Evidently Mr. Frye is also unaware of how such films as *Citizen Kane*, *The Magnificent Ambersons*, *The Long Voyage Home* and *How Green Is My Valley* were matched musically note by note with almost each individual frame of the visuals. This was an extremely delicate, sensitive and mathematical job.

With seemingly accustomed ease Mr. Frye says: "But Hollywood still thinks of music as 'sound effects'." Once again I am afraid Mr. Frye is displaying a certain ignorance about the Film. Music alone and unrelated to the visual frames is nothing. Music used alone and related to the visual sequences is still not very much. But the beauty of sound is the beauty of all sounds. By this I mean, music is only one track. There are numerous sound tracks used. The composite tract is the integration of all the sound tracks dissolved. And in that there is the art of sound. Music when discussed as applied to the film, must be treated in all its aspects and not dealt with separately as Mr. Frye has attempted to do.

"Still photography, apart from portraiture, is more epigrammatic than painting, and is more dependent than painting on the picturesque." I do not wish to appear technical or erudite on the subject, because I most certainly am not. But compared with Mr. Frye I feel like an ancient scholar. Photography both is and is not "more dependent than painting on the picturesque." That is entirely dependent upon what use you make of the camera and whether you use black and white film or one of the several species of color film, and what kind of filter is used. A very ordinary scene can be made very colorful or a very colorful and picturesque scene made to look very ordinary.

The variations are endless. I felt I had to say something upon seeing Frye's article, as so many people these days are blatantly discussing the film without any apparent knowledge on the subject.

TROOPER L. J. HEAPS,

Camp Borden, C.A.C. A9.

(I tried to make it clear that I was approaching the subject from the point of view of an inexpert layman, and from this point of view it does not matter whether the music is discussed in all its aspects or in separate aspects or squawk by squawk. I know that it is an extremely difficult and complicated job to relate sound tracks to a film, but I also know that, in the movies Mr. Heaps mentions, it adds up to a very unimpressive musical result, and the musical result was what I was talking about. The phrase "sound effects" I took from Orson Welles' peroration to *The Magnificent Ambersons*. I do not understand how my point about the relation of photography to painting, whether correct in itself or not, can be affected by the use of a filter in the former any more than by the use of a palette knife in the latter, so I must let it go. I was glad to receive Mr. Heaps' letter, which, apart from its rather laborious irony, is interesting and informative. N.F.)

The Editor,
The Canadian Forum.

Is not Mr. Tolbridge's attack on Mr. Murray unnecessarily bitter and suspicious? No one who has read the reports of the Parliamentary Committee would deny that Mr. Murray's expense accounts and allowances were handled by the CBC with great lack of wisdom; in this as in other respects, the Board of Governors seems to have been derelict in carrying out its responsibilities to the public. But to suggest, as Mr. Tolbridge does, that Mr. Murray, in trying to become "persona grata" with the leaders of the press and entertainment business, was necessarily selling out public service broadcasting to competing private interests seems to me simply ludicrous.

HESTER JAMES.

(Mr. Murray was not powerful enough to "sell out" the CBC to private interests. But, together with his expressed attitude toward

the private stations, the money and time spent by him in relations with private interests generally indicated a degree of solicitude for them scarcely in keeping with his position as a public servant. The board, of course, must share the blame. R.B.T.)

Winter Weather

Wintering time and weather with
the mercury low and locked in wrestling winds
precipitate upon our breath
snows that are not our sin:
so do not blame the frozen face
and eyes whose very tears are ice,
nor the dipping pole has spoked the race
thrown out of gear the wise
and well bred wonder, love,
the mechanised passion and blue-print kisses
and the streamlined marriage that seemed unmov-
ably stable and was not really missed.
For shall he not who backs the wind
and on his left hand feels it know
the storms are near that to the blind
such bitter bleakness sow?
Then not this fanged and fearful frost
green-griming and still balmless blight
but, after all, this putting to rest
and at long last winter quiet;
not the thin blood which God knows He
made for the gardens of Babylon and
moon drenched Cyclades above a tideless sea:
not the environmental and germ-true man,
but blame, if you must, this prime
unreasonable claim against the drift
and masking shadow and the time
turning away from Egypt's cleft
embosoming but embattled love;
the little Shulammitte that prized
Solomon above the lilies, and above
the green of Eden, an Eden fossilised.
Blame this, if at all—the dry, unsatiated cry
for lips that yet more red than human are
and for those arms would underly
eternity, but not this hour.

James Wreford.

Only Be Silent

Tonight is too lovely to say good-night in;
Let us not say it, only dream
Of the fragrant hours that our love was bright in,
The gallant leaf and the laughing stream.
Let us not speak of the dawn or the noontide;
Only be silent breast to breast,
Feeling the pull of the surging moontide,
Finding the calm where a heart may rest.

Gilean Douglas.

Lady Remington

Lie down beside her, soldier,
And do but use her well,
And she can ease your passion
With cries and powder smell.
Be reckless in your loving;
Her grace makes no one poor,
For only bullets issue
From such an iron whore.

Lieutenant Irving Layton.

NUTRITION—CANADA'S NEGLECTED ALLY

Genevieve Allan

► EVERY self-respecting, progressive newspaper with un-failing regularity carries articles about housing. Undoubtedly this is in the national interest since every one realizes that housing has a definite influence on health. Yet the Prime Minister put housing and nutrition on an equal plane of importance in his October 8th address before the A. F. of L. It has been shown that nutrition has a more important role to play in protecting the health of the nation than has housing. In support of this statement I quote Sir Walter M. Fletcher, late president of the Medical Research Council of England: "No direct observer of these results (research into improved dietary for schoolboys) ... could fail to be impressed with the unwisdom of giving a policy of better housing, desirable as that may be in itself, the priority over a policy of better nutrition. First things should come first." Equally conclusive are the words of England's eminent nutritionist and author, Sir John Orr, "The advantages to be obtained by better housing are limited by inadequacy of diet and the maximum advantage can only be obtained by improvement in both."

In England, where the health of the people has actually been improved in spite of rationing, the credit must go to the Ministry of Health for its careful attention to nutrition. Probably the greatest contributing factor in this regard has been the establishment of community kitchens, or British restaurants as they are called, where well-balanced meals can be purchased at cost. It may be argued that Canada is not yet in need of such a scheme. Yet Elsa Maxwell was enthusiastic about the idea when she took part in an "Answering You" two-way radio program from England to America recently. It is certain Miss Maxwell was reflecting public sentiment or possibly pre-conceiving it, in her response. If Canada could prepare for such a scheme now, currently with the United States, and would encourage women to use the facilities thus provided, the response to appeals for more war workers would undoubtedly be tremendous. It is true that many war plants have established cafeterias with the assistance of Nutrition Services of the Department of Pensions and National Health. Yet many plants are without this service. The old-fashioned lunch pail with its hunk of bread and cold uninspired filling, is still the lot of many workers. Furthermore, we cannot say that the only people assisting the war effort work in munition or airplane factories. There are hundreds of auxiliary businesses which must be maintained in order that our armies and munition workers, yes, and the remaining civilian population, may make their maximum effort. Why should not everyone contributing to the war effort directly or indirectly (and who are not?) be provided with inexpensive properly planned and prepared meals, if desired? The seventeen hundred British restaurants are not making any serious inroads into the business of private restaurateurs or limiting free enterprise, yet they feed 100,000,000 meals weekly! There is no reason to suppose that the same fact would not hold for Canada.

Reaping the bitter fruit of inadequate relief diets during the depression years still continues in the rejection of many young men wishing to serve King and Country. Yet as early as February, 1941, Dr. E. W. McHenry of the University of Toronto's School of Hygiene made the following statement:

"So far as the army is concerned hundreds of volunteers have been rejected as unfit for category A when all they required to make them fit was a period of three or four months on a proper diet." In England, 1,000 rejected men were fed an adequate diet for a period of six months. At the end of that time 859 were able to pass the draft regulations. Yet nothing of this sort has been tried in Canada, even though our food resources are more than abundant.

Absenteeism is a vital problem in a majority of factories producing war materials and in other industries essential to the war effort, especially where shift work is necessary. Various reasons have been advanced for this, yet no one has suggested that there might be a relationship between poor feeding and absenteeism. As with school children, so with war workers, surely the ability to concentrate might be improved by better food. But the workers must be made to realize this. The most practical way of course is to provide good food inexpensively, if not on the spot, then close at hand. The more subtle but equally important thing relative to this public realization of the importance of food is, of course, popular education. There should be more fanfare, more eye-catching posters, more catch-phrases about food. The romantic stories of the discovery of the vitamins would make excellent movie shorts which would reach a large section of the population. Who could resist the appeal of the story of the wrecked ship whose salvaged cargo of whole wheat flour rescued a small community from the ravages of beri beri? Or in these days of modern warfare who could fail to be interested in a picturization of Wellington's soldiers in the Peninsular wars? Famous not only as battle heroes but as men of fine physique, their rations consisted of whole wheat grain, frequently eaten as issued, supplemented with meat, usually from goats they might be lucky enough to catch in the mountain!

In a seven hundred mile trip by train and bus in central and northern Ontario, I saw many reminders of one's duty to one's country, many urgent requests to save and buy war stamps, and but one poster on nutrition. And where was it? In a Michigan Central Railway Station. That poster in an American railway station in an Ontario town is but one illustration of the relative prominence being given nutrition by the two countries. In the United States, in 1941, 5 million school children sat down to a balanced noon meal at school. In February, 1942, the banner month, 6.2 million children had hot lunches provided for them. The average cost to the government was 2 cents a day for every child who was fed. The school lunch program began over four years ago.

In England, the plan is perhaps even better established than in the United States. When is it to receive the attention it should in Canada? Only when parents and teachers become interested enough to demand it. And who is to initiate this interest? Those who are responsible for the public welfare. In our country this means the Department of Pensions and National Health. Many voluntary service groups such as Women's Institutes, the Red Cross, teachers' associations, etc., have made valiant efforts along the line of nutrition education. However, partly because of this "diversity of tongues," the work done has been what we might call "spotty." Some few localities who have been fortunate enough to have qualified leaders with sufficient free time have received some benefits, but by and large the work has not made the country-wide impression which it should. No one realizes this better than the Government, whose "Nutrition Services" have actually worked out a very good plan. Under this title "The Canadian Nutrition Programme" this plan was released in printed form in July of last year. It deals thoroughly with the organization of community nutrition programs and makes excellent sug-

questions for publicity. Before the community will be ready to take the plan seriously, however, there must be national publicity for it, just as there is for our Victory Loans, War Savings Stamp sales and every other project which it is hoped the community will ultimately adopt and "put over." Having laid down what might be called a barrage of heavy artillery of nation-wide publicity, the forces working for nutrition are now able to move in on the community. The question is "Who will constitute these forces?" Before any ground can be covered, many workers must themselves be carefully trained. Much more education is needed here than for any of our other "drives." Yet many localities lack trained nutritionists entirely. Others have too few capable of carrying on continuously, unless at least one is on a full-time basis. A paid worker devoting her entire time to supervising the community's nutrition program will have much more prestige with the business men, who will be expected to co-operate with her than a "volunteer." The confidence of the general public in a paid worker is so much greater, too, that a finer response to her work is a foregone conclusion. Surely the resultant better health of whole communities is worth this expenditure. Of course "Nutrition Services" recognizes the need for paid nutritionists. Without national publicity however it is doubtful if the community as a whole, or service clubs within it, will undertake to finance such a worker.

General Parran of the Public Health Service of the United States says that we know now what constitutes "a gold standard for nutrition." Let us build the health and morale of the nation upon that standard and food will assume the importance it should as an ally in our struggle for survival against the forces of tyrannical dictatorship. In the formulation of a sound food policy for the whole world, we are solving one of the "Problems of Lasting Peace" (Hoover & Gibson). Discarding the fear of want provides a prophylaxis against discontent and unrest, the seeds of war and revolution.

A HOUSING PLAN FOR CANADA

J. F. C. Smith

IN CANADA, the issue of good housing is habitually confused with the abstract matter of individual home ownership. We look upon our dwellings more as material possessions than as vehicles for contemporary living. To us the house appears almost a completely self-contained unit. Nothing could be more mistaken.

A house needs streets, services and utilities just as much as it needs a site. It must be located near schools and shops, and work should be available not too far away. Places of recreation, entertainment and worship should be equally accessible. The same applies to transportation facilities. There have to be adequate fire and police protection and a sufficient number of parks and open spaces. Zoning regulations must guard against commercial encroachments.

Such has been the haphazard, uncontrolled growth of our cities that these essentials are rarely found together. Unprecedented industrial expansion in the 19th and early 20th centuries made any sort of orderly urban development impossible. Swollen by immigration, population increased faster than it could be absorbed. Eager to escape the congestion and noise, the dirt and smoke of decaying down-

town sections, those who could afford to do so sought refuge in new residential areas on the outskirts.

What had been farmland was subdivided into narrow frontage lots and sold at exorbitant prices to private individuals and speculative builders. The builders operated on too small a scale to realize any worthwhile savings, and opposition of the building trades to innovations in traditional building methods helped to keep costs high. Neighborhood planning was, of course, practically unknown. Sun, air and privacy were luxuries denied even to the well-to-do. Streets, for the most part laid out in an uninspired checker-board pattern, were lined with jostling caricatures of foreign or long-dead architectural styles. A tiny passageway between houses preserved an illusion of free-standing independence. Financing, under the mortgage system, saddled the would-be homeowner with debt for many years.

Save for the odd shacktown thrown up far beyond municipal limits, the poor played no part in the exodus from the city. They were abandoned to the slums. Attention to their plight was occasionally drawn by investigating committees and social service groups. Public conscience would be startled by the depths of degradation and despair revealed, alarmed at the impressive toll exacted in harboring these breeding-places of disease, immorality and crime. Still, no effective remedies were ever adopted. Responsibility was simply shuffled from municipal to provincial and from provincial to federal authorities.

The condition of the average income group was not so conspicuous, but only a degree less serious. Though its members composed the bulk of the population, they could make no real demand for even such new housing as was available. Profit was small in building for them, and private enterprise restricted itself almost exclusively to catering to those in the upper-income brackets. When depression struck, practically all residential construction ceased. The shortage thus created caused further over-crowding and sacrifice for the middle class.

It was conclusively shown at the National Conference on Housing, held in Toronto in February, 1939, that 50% of the urban families in Canada could not afford as much as \$25 a month for rent. At that time, \$30,000,000 was available under Part II of the National Housing Act to municipalities and limited dividend corporations for the erection of low-rental housing. But even with this assistance, calculations of prevailing building costs showed that it was impossible to provide for these citizens at the price they were able to pay.

Today, we have little to exhibit in the way of housing but crowded, filthy slums, miles of shoddy suburban dreariness, and a handful of millionaires' retreats. Futile attempts at home ownership have led to foreclosures, evictions and worthless mortgages. Municipalities, with blight gnawing at their vitals and facing a rising tide of tax delinquencies, have frequently been unable to meet payments on obligations assumed in the all-too-optimistic days of sub-division expansion. Many have been engulfed in, or narrowly escaped, bankruptcy.

Europe, on the other hand, has millions of low-rental, high quality modern dwellings permanently removed from the speculative market. One-seventh of the European population lives in them. They are located in comprehensively planned communities having a maximum of efficiency, attractiveness and long-range economy. After the last war, an acute housing shortage was accompanied by the complete breakdown of the old agencies of dwelling production. The nations and cities of Europe found that they could no longer afford the extravagance of the sub-standard, chaotic method of house construction which we know. Housing became, in effect, a public utility.

While many of the governments under which the greatest progress was recorded are now extinct, their achievement in establishing a new standard of human environment must be acknowledged. Dr. Catherine Bauer, contrasting the characteristics of European housing which distinguish it from anything in existence here, writes: "For one thing, it is built for efficient use over a period of years; therefore, it is not designed primarily for quick profits. It is 'planned': and so it must be non-speculative. This new housing method recognizes that the integral unit for planning, the economical unit for construction and administration, and the social unit for living, is the complete neighborhood, designed and equipped as such. A modern housing development does not, therefore, constitute a mere mechanical extension of streets and agglomeration of individual, competitive dwellings. It has a beginning and an end, and some sort of visible, organic form. One part is related to another part, and each part serves a particular, predestined use. It can never deteriorate into a slum, or a 'blighted area', or a case for expensive remedial 'city planning'."

Major highways by-pass the modern housing development; access is provided by secondary roads and dead-end streets arranged so as not to interfere with pedestrian traffic. The focal point is usually a community recreation centre, sometimes a school. It is set in the midst of park land, around which are arranged the buildings. There are apartments, row houses and single dwellings—enough variety to satisfy the needs of every conceivable family type. All are oriented to take advantage of winter sun and summer breezes. Amenities like space, quiet and cross-ventilation are the property of everyone. So too, are communal services such as laundry, creche and central heating. Shops are conveniently situated on the outside diameter of the development. In the case of larger projects, which often reach the proportions of good-sized towns, factories lie beyond a wide green belt of trees and grass that permanently restricts the growth of the community to carefully calculated dimensions.

This superior housing can be had for a sum which citizens of average income and less can afford. And it is possible under our own system of democratic government. The British example furnishes ample proof.

Public responsibility for the building and renting of low-cost dwellings was admitted in Great Britain as long ago as 1851. The tremendous steps taken since then have resulted in that country now boasting the most comprehensive housing legislation in the world. During the years between World Wars I and II, the number of new dwellings erected reached the enormous total of four million. More than half were put up through some form of government assistance to public authorities, public utility societies, and private individuals. Unassisted private enterprise was responsible for the remainder. That the latter was able to construct such a large number of houses in this period is evidence that the activities of the government were in a field untouched by conventional real estate and building practice. Subsidies, by the way, made up an astonishingly small percentage of the average annual budget.

American housing legislation on a national scale is chiefly based on British models, but dates only from 1932. The Housing Division of the Public Works Administration, which was set up at that time to plan and build demonstration projects on its own, has since been replaced by the United States Housing Authority. Through it, financial aid is extended to state or local public housing agencies for the development and operation of low-rent housing and slum clearance projects. The money required for its maintenance is raised from the sale of bonds guaranteed by the government.

In Canada, we have the National Housing Act of 1938. Part I of this statute made house-building and the assumption of a mortgage burden, for persons with a small equity, somewhat easier than was previously possible. Part III provided, with municipal co-operation, certain tax exemptions on new dwellings. Part II, which became inoperative in 1940, marked our only venture in the realm of low-cost, low-rental housing. It was a thorough fiasco. During its two years of life, it was not utilized once. The reason was not lack of need or appreciation of such legislation. Many attempts were made to take advantage of its provisions without success. As the late Arthur B. Purvis pointed out, the fault was that there was no accompanying executive organization set up to enable it to function.

When the time comes to revise the National Housing Act, this mistake must not be repeated. In fact, our whole method of attack is due for overhauling and improvement. The only program worth considering is the complete one. While the primary aim should be to make possible, at a price he can afford, the sort of accommodation the average wage-earner deserves, slum clearance and the rehabilitation of our cities must not be forgotten. Problems affecting rural housing—in many ways worse off than its urban counterpart—must be solved. The establishment of a unified, permanent administration consisting of both national and local authorities, and an adequate planning and expediting organization, will require careful thought. Large-scale operations, assisted by all the devices of mass production and pre-fabrication, must be employed in the interests of economy. Money must be obtained for financing; housing loans have to be made at low interest rates and are best amortized over a long period of time. Limited profits and a system of federal subsidies will be essential.

Also desirable will be clearer definition than exists at present of dominion, provincial and municipal responsibility, a more equitable manner of property taxation, introduction of proper town and country planning regulations, and legislation which will facilitate the functioning of building societies and housing co-operatives.

Under the changed conditions outlined, the first housing projects to be built will not only establish a gauge by which the nation will estimate the entire program: they will constitute a model for subsequent efforts. Even the slightest chance of failure must be eliminated. Bearing in mind the shortcomings of the existing, uncoordinated organizations responsible for such housing as we now have, it will likely be necessary for the government itself to carry out the initial stages of construction. This was the case in the United States under similar circumstances. Later, when experience has been gained and private enterprise is fully acquainted with the new technique, execution of the venture can be put into its hands.

After victory is won, we shall face the task of training and re-fitting for civil life the men released from uniform. Employment will have to be found for them and for the workers now engaged in war industries. The time to formulate the policy which will determine how worthwhile and of how much lasting value that employment will be, is the present. We cannot delay. When hostilities cease, the need will be too acute for detached judgment and calm deliberation. Granted that there can be no more commendable objective than to utilize our productive energies to raise Canada's housing standards, preliminary investigation and discussion should be begun at once. As Lord Reith has said, "Planning system and plans must be ready. We know what unpreparedness for war has meant. To be unprepared for peace may be far more serious."

Optional

You do not obscure the skyline
With geometric stone
And varnished cubes can blister
Even in the temperate zone.

You can defeat the skyline
By drawing in the sky
To web around diaphanous
Your sad obscurity.

The green edge can be razor
With an acid bite
If in slits and oozing
Is your delight.

But if you can take your skyline
Or leave it alone
Nothing has much edge on
Geometric stone.

Margaret Avison.

In Abraham's Bosom

Under an olive tree so old that God
Had made it, sat Abraham of an afternoon.
Old he was and the tongue had grown far bitterer
Than the word, and he cried out: "Like the voice
Of the hawks does everything cry to me . . . And who
Will remember the thin grasses at my feet
And this earth-bloom that is so sweet to the breath
And so bitter to the heart? And who will remember
The barley fields, and the reapers taking their money
In the evening and their going home along the roads?
They have sat down at night to supper and who
Will think of it? They have made ready for the night,
The terrible night, and gone down heavy with dreams . . .
O the pity of anything at all that it
Should know the sunlight for a while and then be lost:
These days that are held so high among the men,
Being the little they possess of time;
The land, that it should be like an empty house
With the wind in it and strangers passing on the road."
When the sun held out the night no more,
Isaac came from the house and stood beside
His father, and Abraham told him what
Had befallen his heart that afternoon, and Isaac
May have thought of the new woman in the tent,
But he said little and while the old man talked,
Kindled a small fire; here where autumn
After autumn the dark fires burned, the miracle of smoke
Grew under his hands. The night grew big and their voices
Small, dying where the shadow of firelight died.
"You would hardly remember love," said Abraham,
"Were it not for loving. It is a thing never
To be remembered but only known. Before
You would ever think of it you would remember
The wind pressing upon the tent, the little
Cries or the laughter and before the dusk was quite
Gone, the glitter of eyes like the flashing of deep
Lights, deep and lovely and strange. You may have come
Upon an unknown place in that hour, but you
Cannot remember it, you cannot remember it. And you
Would not believe how cunningly it is hidden: you
Would never dream how you were used by love,
That when you were gone into the tent it was not you
But love, entering into itself. You would hardly remember
Love . . .

"This is the day that I have seen the hawks,
The perfect hawks turning above the hill;
Time is a memory, and I should not remember
The sun going down upon this day except
For hawks. But memory is not recollection
Only. It is a light; when I have remembered
Anything . . . and turned to go . . . then I
Have beheld the unremembering night where, though
I have walked upon its fields, beholding nothing,
I wandered in darkness through lost times.
Lost! Lost! Lost! Lost! Lost!
O I would remember everything and search
The deep world for every lost thing,
Every person and every thing, every word,
Every want; every wind the grass
Leaned after, and the night under every leaf."

George Curtisinger.

PROPHET OF THE NORTH

D. M. LeBourdais

► THIRTY-SIX years ago Vilhjalmur Stefansson, then a lanky young anthropologist, set forth from Harvard on his first Arctic expedition. His going to the Arctic was largely an accident: he previously expected to go to Africa. But it was a fortunate accident for him, because in the Far North he found his life-work.

Some persons imagine that because Stefansson was born in Canada of Icelandic parents he came naturally by his love for the North, but that does not necessarily follow. Once he had seen the Arctic, however, he was attracted to it because of all places in the world it was the most misunderstood; and also because of the part which, in his opinion, it was destined one day to play in the fortunes of men. More important still, he was intrigued by its people.

Stefansson is a scientist; but he is also a disseminator of ideas, a publicist. He is a magnificent advocate. Year in and year out he has preached his philosophy of the North. In addition to continuous lecturing, he has written a dozen books, collaborated in the writing of half a dozen more, and inspired scores of others. Many men had gone north before Stefansson. They were geographers, sailors, explorers, traders, some mere travellers. But Stefansson went as an ethnologist, a student of man. He saw the Arctic through an ethnologist's eyes. His first Arctic winter was spent with an Eskimo family, in their little sod and driftwood house, living on fish and game.

It was a wonderful opportunity for an ethnologist. He found himself living as one of them with people whose culture was that of the Stone Age. It was not necessary for him to dig up the bones of people long since dead and laboriously deduce their ways from such puny remains. He lived with men, women and children who were still following the ways of the Stone Age. Yet they were conscious of no anachronism; their mode of life was eminently suited to their environment.

Seeing the people thus, Stefansson was enabled to see their country with new eyes. Gradually the misconceptions that he had brought with him were dispelled. He realized with a shock which was to change the whole course of his life that the Arctic could not be such a terrible place as he (and most other people) had previously imagined. Unless the Eskimos were much less susceptible to the pangs of hunger and to the effects of cold than other people, their country could not be as terrible a place as it was popularly supposed to be; children were born there and grew to

maturity; old people lived out their allotted span; and, altogether, within the limits of a Stone Age environment, the people enjoyed full, well-rounded lives. When once these facts were realized, it was not possible for Stefansson ever again to see the Arctic other than as a friendly land; and he was never more sincere than when he called his greatest book—probably the most significant Arctic book ever written.—*The Friendly Arctic* (The Macmillan Co., 1921).

Stefansson brought the method of Arctic exploration by dog and sledge to perfection; and by adopting and improving upon the Eskimo custom of living off the country he enabled his parties to remain indefinitely in the North, practically independent of the outside world. But his exploits in this field marked the end of an era, for even as he was developing his technique of Arctic exploration, the airplane was being established as a practical means of transportation, not an inventor's dream as some had contended. Stefansson was one of the first to appreciate the change which the development of aviation was to make in the relative position of the Arctic. It is worth noting, in passing, that the greatest of the aerial explorers, Sir Hubert Wilkins, got his first Arctic experience as a member of a Stefansson expedition.

The largest land masses of the globe, where live most of the world's people, are in the northern hemisphere. These great land masses are broadest toward the north and come nearest to each other across the relatively small Arctic Ocean. Thus the shortest distances between important points in Europe, Asia and North America are across the top of the world. The Arctic Ocean has too much ice floating on its surface to be of any great value for sea navigation, but the air over the Arctic regions is in some respects more suited to aviation than in any other section of the world. Alaska comes within fifty miles of the eastern extremity of Siberia, providing almost a continuous land route to Asia. A world war has been required for the value of this geographical feature to be even partly appreciated. A highway and a line of airfields are now being built which, if Stefansson's views had been given due weight by Canadians, might have been built at any time during the past dozen years, especially when so many eager to work were walking our streets in idleness.

Eastward, the great Hudson waterway brings the ocean almost to the heart of Canada; but here again shortsightedness has largely curtailed the usefulness of this great potential transportation route. The war, however, is bringing Greenland and Iceland, hitherto veiled by the mists of popular misconception, into a much closer focus.

Iceland was settled in the ninth century by Norsemen who established there a republic that lasted for three hundred years and was in many respects the most remarkable in history. The parliament which they founded in 930 met annually for nearly a thousand years in a sunken lava plain, and, in point of age at least, is entitled to be called the grandmother of parliaments.

The Iceland sagas, produced at a time when Europe lay under the blight of the Dark Ages, constitute a literary legacy of which any nation might well be proud. They consist mainly of historical and biographical narratives inseparably blending fact and fiction. Handed down originally by word of mouth from one story-teller to another during a period of more than two hundred years, they were set to parchment by unknown writers when the art of writing was introduced.

This little volcanic island in the North Atlantic has occupied a high place in the scale of civilization for a thousand

and years; and the claim has been made for it that "in proportion to its population its contribution to human progress has been greater than that of any other region except ancient Greece and Palestine."

From Iceland, Greenland was discovered, as was inevitable, since on a clear day the one can be seen from the other. It was next but a step from Greenland to the great land mass lying to the westward; and thus, half a millenium before Columbus dreamed his dream of a western way to China, Icelanders discovered, repeatedly visited, and lived upon the land which was to be known as North America.

For five hundred years Greenland was the home of thriving Norse colonies; but when, through the vicissitudes of European trade and policy they were progressively cut off from outside contact, they became absorbed into the Eskimo population and practically all trace of them disappeared. Their disappearance was for many years one of the Arctic's deepest mysteries, but Arctic scholars, Stefansson among them, now agree with the view given above.

In 1910, travelling eastward with Eskimo companions along the north coast of Canada, Stefansson encountered native groups never before seen by white men, some of whom possessed physical characteristics which suggested an admixture of European blood. His account of this meeting with these people in whose veins might have coursed the blood of the vanished Greenland Norsemen, which he gives in his *My Life With The Eskimo* (The Macmillan Co., 1913), is one of the most fascinating passages in all the annals of exploration.

* Now that the war has shifted public attention to these far northern lands, and since Alaska, Greenland and Iceland have moved into the front-line position in world-war strategy, the United States Government is availing itself more and more of Stefansson's remarkable knowledge of everything pertaining to the North. The extent to which it has drawn upon him is, of course, a prime military secret.

The popular interest that has been aroused in regard to these lands, however, has encouraged him to supply the demand for information thus created, and in 1939 he published *Iceland: The First American Republic* (Doubleday, Doran & Co.) which should, for its fortunate readers, put that hitherto little known island and its people in their proper geographical and historical places.

He has now performed a similar service for Greenland.* In this latest book he tells of the Norse migrations which resulted in the peopling of Iceland and Greenland and the discovery of North America; and he describes the gradual absorption of the colonists by the Eskimos. While much of the history of Greenland is also the history of Iceland, Stefansson's two books are complementary rather than repetitive.

Descriptions of climatic, geographic and topographic features help to show the part which Greenland might play in wartime; and also show the part it could play in peacetime if people would but exchange existing misconceptions for a recognition of but two fundamental facts: that the world is a sphere, the distance around it becoming less as one recedes from the Equator; and that temperature does not progressively decrease from Equator to Pole, but is modified by a variety of circumstances which operate to produce in many Arctic lands climatic conditions greatly at variance with the popular conception.

Canada, essentially a northern country, has much to gain from a greater realization of these simple geographic facts. For this reason, if for no other, Stefansson's books should be on the suggested reading lists of all our schools.

*GREENLAND: Vilhjalmur Stefansson; New York; Doubleday, Doran & Co.; pp. 318; \$3.50.

MR. SMITH'S GERMAN REVOLUTION

Martin Dell

►THE North African Darlan episode provides a foretaste of the bitterness that will arise between the United Nations if the peace aims discussion is not soon based on the understanding of that which is possible. Not only that; it is easy to see that if the discussion is not taken up before we have won victory it will never be taken up. There will then be as much collective security after victory as there was between 1933 and 1939. And one does not need to be a prophet either to see that peace aims discussion and settlement now would shorten the war.

Why, then, is there no such discussion as yet? The answer is: because the United Nations cannot agree on what to do about Germany. The fact ought not to be concealed. What history will do about Germany is determined by the logic of history. Statesmen, politicians, and demagogues, however, seldom trouble to study that logic because most of them believe it is they who make history. "Idealist" social and historical philosophy cannot, of course, do anything to discourage that flattering belief.

Most of the men who are concerned with shaping the policies of the United Nations think that it merely takes some bright ideas to deal with Germany. They all have bright ideas, and the bright ideas are all very different. They are also senseless. For history, that is, the movement of social forces, allows only such ideas to prevail as are apt to accentuate and accelerate its trend. Ideas which are out of line with that trend are of no consequence.

The Nazi idea of Germany's "destiny" is out of line. So are most non-Nazi ideas on the problem. Among the non-Nazi ideas which are in line are some that are held by certain Germans. It is most likely that those Germans will be important during the last phase of the war. The social forces inside Germany which will overthrow Nazism will constitute part of the logic of history. The attempt to ignore them may be appealing to certain people, but they can as little be ignored and replaced by bright ideas, or even by violence, as could the Bolsheviks from 1917 to 1921.

Social forces are, of course, anything but philosophical abstractions and are visible to the naked eye; or so one should think. But then one sees that about a dozen American journalists have spent two years in wartime Germany and have come back to write books and have nothing to say about the social forces which are at work inside that country. To be sure, these journalists are stout anti-Nazis, but they detest Nazism because it has done this or that, something or other; and in some cases one cannot help feeling—certainly unjustified—that the detestation might not be so great if the Nazis had not done some particular something or other.

One can therefore for once agree with a blurb that calls the book of an American journalist "sensational." The sensation of *Last Train from Berlin** lies not in what the author relates but in the fact that he tries to understand what he relates. It is clear why he does not succeed in his endeavor: he says he is a socialist but in fact he only believes he is one.

Let us of the many points which Smith makes consider only the most important. He says there are three distinct elements of revolt in Germany: the Communists, the Church (especially the Catholic Church), and the Prussian military

caste. Of the Communists: "Their value to the opponents of Nazism can only make itself materially evident after a revolt has begun and made considerable progress. Then, no doubt, they may become important, perhaps even decisive." One cannot quarrel with this. Smith sees correctly that revolt must come from below and that when it has assumed a certain proportion the revolutionary élite must be ready to take over the leadership in order to make a revolution out of the revolt. He is, however, pathetically wrong if he believes that any spirit of revolt which may be engendered by the activities of the Church can form the basis of social revolution. Whenever it would become apparent that the Communists were preparing to capitalize the "unrest" fomented by the Church, that unrest will stop very quickly. Apart from that, the church-goers are lower middle-class people, and they will not go on the barricades to overthrow Hitler in any case. The movement that will be taken over by the Communists will not come from church-goers but from workers.

Two pages later Smith says: "Popular discontent is secondary because no revolution in history has ever begun by popular discontent." How, then, does a revolution begin? "By a conflict in the palace," says Smith. Therefore, he believes that "the third element of revolt, the discontent and uneasiness of the military leadership, is at this moment the most important of the only three organized elements of revolt that exist in Germany." With this sentence Smith qualifies for a high post in the State Department in Washington. One sees that he cannot even distinguish between revolt and revolution.

In some other place he says quite rightly: "The ultimate criterion of the effectiveness of any political party is its material results." And having said that he throws his three "organizations" together simply because they are organizations. The question of what they are organized for is apparently immaterial to him, and organization as such is everything in his judgment.

Hundreds of acts of sabotage have been reported from all the occupied territories, but not a single one from Germany, he says, and concludes that the Communists in Germany are weaker than elsewhere. The opposite conclusion is of course the correct one. The German Communists are out to overthrow Hitler, and not to blow up a few trains. The Communists, and the opposition in general, in some of the other occupied countries are not organized, and therefore desperation drives them to perform meaningless acts of sabotage. Many of their people are caught in such acts and thus are lost for the final struggle. That is not revolutionary socialist strategy.

The most magnificent of Smith's wrong conclusions is that he declares the Russians do not estimate the strength of the German Communists too highly or they would have appealed to them to revolt. The German Communists may be weak but they could never be so weak as that conclusion. We must remember that Smith writes of the period preceding the United States' entry into the war. Imagine Stalin at that time calling upon the German Communists to rise and ask yourself whether in that case the Americans would have come in on our side! There are not many people today who, whatever else they may think of Stalin, believe that he is a fool. But even a year ago there was no justification for believing that he was as foolish as that. His reason for not even now calling upon the German Communists would appear somewhat different from what it was a year ago; but this is not the place to go into the question.

In spite of its weaknesses we maintain that Smith's book is more worth reading than any other that has come from American journalists on the subject of Germany at war.

*LAST TRAIN FROM BERLIN: Howard K. Smith; Ryerson (Knopf); pp. 359; \$3.25.

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

THE ROBE: Lloyd Douglas; Thomas Allen; pp. 695; \$3.00.

The Robe is already appearing on best-seller lists and among library books-of-the-month. Its theme, however, will prevent its acceptance among the sceptics of the intellectual world. Actually, the fate of the Roman soldier who tossed for Christ's robe at the Crucifixion and won it, is a perfectly legitimate basis for a literary work. It is surprising that it has not been used before—or has it?

Mr. Douglas has gone to a good deal of trouble to make the young Roman, Marcellus, as much like a fairly intelligent modern man of the world as possible in his general attitude towards life, and particularly toward religion. Some of his conversations bristle with twentieth century slang expressions. As for his thoughts on religion and those of his contemporaries, they are very similar to those of many people of our own time. In the words of Marcus Gallio, father of Marcellus, "There is something fundamentally wrong with a rich man or a king who pretends to be religious. Let the poor and helpless invoke the gods. That is what the gods are for—to distract the attention of the weak from their otherwise intolerable miseries. When an emperor makes much ado about religion, he is either cracked or crooked."

By a fairly logical sequence of events, Marcellus found himself in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover, having gone as an officer in the Roman army to help keep order while the Jewish feast was in progress. His sense of justice was outraged by the Crucifixion, and the possession of the robe was a continual reminder of his part in it. His slave, Demetrius, discovering the power of the robe, kept it, in spite of the fact that he had been given orders to destroy it.

From the day of the Crucifixion on, Marcellus is no longer master of his own destiny. A mental sickness comes over him, and not until some months later when he handles the robe again, does this sickness leave him. He seems to be compelled by an inner force to find out everything about this man whom he had helped, albeit unwillingly, to put to death. It is in this second half of the novel that the author grows particularly tiresome. The anticlimax is altogether too long drawn out. Mr. Douglas' own magnificent obsession takes precedence over his literary ability. He is at his best in the description of the journey to Jerusalem and of the wanderings of Marcellus among the ordinary people who had known Jesus. When he tries to draw a picture of life in Roman society, he exceeds his powers and the result is irritating.

The reaction of the emperor Tiberius to Marcellus' confession of faith contains an idea which has been held by many through the centuries of the Christian era. Predicting the collapse of the Movement, he says, "The Christian afoot is a formidable fellow—but when he becomes prosperous enough to ride a horse—a Christian on horseback will be just like any other man on horseback! This Jesus army will have to travel on foot if it expects to accomplish anything!"

As a so-called Christian, I found parts of the book arousing many subversive thoughts. In fact, it might even be found worthy of banishment under the Defense of Canada regulations. But it probably won't because too many so-called Christians have been on horseback for too many centuries.

M. I. T.

THE CHILEAN POPULAR FRONT: John Reese Stevenson; University of Pennsylvania Press (U.S.A.); pp. 155; \$1.50.

From Chilean ports flow yearly all the tin to which the Allies have access, 1,000,000 tons of iron for the Bethlehem Steel works in Pennsylvania, nitrates, copper and saltpetre. These exports are developed partly under state and partly under private control with capital partly Chilean and partly provided by the United States Administration through the Inter American Export Import Bank. The political complexion of this rapier Republic 2,000 miles long, between the Andes and the Pacific, is therefore a factor to be considered in the political and economic war of the United Nations versus the Axis in South America.

This government has been, since 1936, a successive coalition of radicals, socialists, communists, radical socialists, workers' socialists and democrats against the liberal conservative opposition which has held an almost equal number of seats in both chambers. Because they choose their own cabinets, the political character of Chile has been determined to some extent by her presidents, Pedro Aguirre Cerda and Juan Antonio Rios, the former from 1936 to '41, and the latter since February, 1942. It is the evolution of the Popular Front coalition of the left, and its real effect on the domestic and foreign policy of Chile, which John Reese Stevenson ably clarifies in "The Chilean Popular Front." It is a very short book, and there are not the personal portraits penned in "Inside Latin America," but, in dealing with Chile, it is much the better book.

The Popular Front was brought into being at the same time and with the same revolutionary aims as the French, Spanish, Mexican and Chinese popular fronts, namely, to block that very tide of war and fascism which, today, envelopes the globe. Stevenson points out that the cry of "Chile for the Chileans" arose because of the control of their economy exerted from Wall Street, but that the Chilean Development Corporation was itself financed not only from taxes, but from loans made by the U.S. through the Inter American Export Import Bank. This corporation is a state enterprise which has subsidized fishing, agriculture and mining whether privately (by Chilean capitalists who are very few), state or co-operatively owned. Were it not for the fact that the capital of the Inter American Bank is partly from U.S. sources the corporation might long ago have developed Chile's water power to the point where it could have supplied the whole South American continent, and consequently developed Brazil's already promising steel production, and thus spared us the necessity of allocating some of our own steel to our great South American ally. Mr. Stevenson has, however, failed to point out that the 21 nations of the Pan-American Union control the capital of the Import Export Bank politically at least, and that the U.S. have agreed to the principle that the resources and capital of this continent must be equally divided according to individual national needs. (Rio Conference).

In assessing the future, Stevenson describes Chile as the most progressive of the South American nations, and the least turbulent in settling her internal problems. He rightly concludes that she belongs to the people's movement which ensures that a world growing smaller daily is likewise growing more democratic, politically, economically and socially.

JOSEPHINE HAMBLETON.

ADMINISTRATION OF LABOUR, AN ESSAY ON PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL ECONOMY: Frantisek Klang, Vladimír Outrata, Alexander Kunosi; George Allen and Unwin; pp. VIII, 100; \$1.15.

This book is by three Czechoslovakians much concerned with developing protection for the producing masses against all forms of exploitation through adequate participation in government. Attention centres mainly on constitutional structure at the international level though the approach is functional and ramifies elsewhere. Labor administration they see as encompassing the whole of administration and they develop an approach to international government after the general manner of the International Labor Organization. The I.L.O. however, has been poorly conceived. Its tripartite composition representative of employer, employee and government is inadequate and unreal. Government representatives are never impartial but are mere mouthpieces of the dominant parties in power. Much world labor furthermore is not carried on according to the bilateral contract between wage-earner and employer but by small owner-worker units like the peasants of central Europe. Even where the bilateral form does exist the line running between the two parties no longer represents definite opposing interests. Finally, the I.L.O. represents no socially conscious attempt to co-ordinate production and consumption; an omission which renders all reformist effort at protection to working people more or less frustrate.

Their proposed outline for a superstate body therefore, while taking the general appearance of a remodelled I.L.O., substitutes for representatives of the present trio of interests, layman delegates, experts, and delegates of executive departments: it also features prominently administrative boards of production and consumption, the latter concerned with administration of food, health, building, education, leisure, family, migration policy and public health; the former with management and control of production including terms of wages and working conditions. A third board has responsibility over distribution of goods and services, while a fourth is concerned with such matters as statistics, research and co-ordination to improve the contact between production and consumption.

Enroute to the above the authors examine two other possible types of superstate administration; one, that of federal union of states based on industrial freedom and featuring the bilateral wage contract supplemented by various devices directed toward protection against exploitation; the other, that of Soviet Russia, existing union of thirty republics, which adheres to the principle "to each according to his work, from each according to his abilities." Both are found wanting. The first, not being based on labor, fails to group around itself all necessary State activities. Consequently, in spite of its high sounding guarantees of personal rights and liberties, it affords no effective system of control and there is no real protection in the essentials. The Soviet system while it sets out on the right principle fails to provide more than the rudiments of lay controls. In contrast with Mr. and Mrs. Sydney Webb they argue that the citizen's control through the franchise in Russia is small compensation for his loss in control as a consumer. Until he becomes an active co-operative partner in administration he cannot be properly safeguarded against "exploitation and shirking"—abuses that originate with state officials.

as well as others. "The *Common People* must get into their hands an instrument powerful enough to intervene where exploitation and shirking occur."

The instrument offered, however, will prove a disappointment to most readers. While there is some reference to "universal audit," and to publicizing the activities of persons in authority, the main dependence is on a legal construct, viz., "actio popularis: every citizen . . . shall be entitled to prosecute (whether it be fellow citizen . . . or official, or contracting officer) if a breach of duty has been committed."

A sorry post facto substitute surely for the active participation they set out to discover! The expansion and arrangement of the book leave much to be desired and for this condition the plea of restriction on space through shortage of paper in Britain will only partly compensate. The book indicates considerable legal erudition but falls short of fulfilling the promise of the sub-title.

H. A. LOGAN.

ECONOMICS FOR WORKERS: Geo. W. Weaver; Education Committee, C.C.F., Vancouver; pp. 36; \$2.00.

This little book is a compilation of lessons in Marxian economics based on the author's lecturing and teaching. They were first published in short instalments in *The Federationist* (Vancouver), during 1938-39, and are now offered in this volume under the auspices of the Education Committee of the B.C. section of the C.C.F. It can be commended as a faithful review of the earliest writings of Marx, uncritical and definitely propagandist. The author claims no originality for the material. "It has all been said by Marx and Engels and their 'disciples' many times over." He has done a good job with exposition and has presented the main principles in compact form. Questions arrayed at the end of each lesson, while intended mostly to stimulate memorization and understanding of the text are sometimes wider in their reach, opening contact with problems of present-day organization. One touch of pathos appears where the student is asked to "Explain—to an unusually stupid Liberal voter—what is meant by (a) Constant Capital, (b) Variable Capital, (c) . . . etc.

This book deserves critical comment on several grounds:—

1. Its title—It is presented as "economics for workers," the suggestion being that it is *The economics for working class people*. In fact, the author is quite explicit in warning his readers against the type taught by university professors who are represented at one stage as scientists of the "astronomer type" interested in recording observations but never in doing anything about it and, at the next, agents of the capitalists obscuring the source of profits and the necessary exploitation of workers in the capitalist system.

Whatever merit there may be in such charges one suspects they also are true copy of Marx and Engels and aimed originally at such villains as Nassau Senior and David Ricardo. The trouble is that the workers don't realize this and are not likely to discriminate. Readers who have been close to the diverse currents of economic theory of the past two decades know well that the world does move and so do universities. In playing for such high stakes in a democratic country as exclusive access to the worker's mind an author should examine for himself those whom he castigates rather than direct against them the very same attitudes and sentiments that his master bore to their forebears. There is no evidence anywhere that Mr. Weaver has any acquaintance with Keynesian Thought—surely a field workers might cultivate with profit, and which in many respects is in the Marxian tradition—or with the "imperfect competition" economics vital to an understanding of modern monopolistic conditions. Profits as might be expected of a pure Marxian are accounted for chiefly in terms of labor exploitation with little attention to lack of competition among firms.

2. Mr. Weaver by his own admission draws upon only the first volume of *Capital*. This, it is true, is the Marx that most Marxians know and swear by and that fact is important. Yet the omission implied is to be regretted, for while Marx, the challenging proselytizer, speaks from it, Vol. I is nevertheless the work of an unfinished thinker. The mature examination of theoretic problems and the persistent reach after realism are more characteristic of the later volumes. They can scarcely be left out of a proper portrayal of Marx. One recent and very competent writer, interpreting from a mastery of all three volumes, speaks of "the uphill struggle of Marx's own mind from the simple dogmatism of the first volume of *Capital* to the intricate formulations of Vol. III." "But," she remarks "if we start from the vantage ground of Vol. III the journey is much less arduous."* Surely in fairness an interpreter is under some obligation to present a great writer's whole thought upon a particular subject.

3. One feels again as he reads a book like this, with due respect to the author's modesty regarding originality, that an interpreter

*Joan Robinson, *Essay on Marxian Economics* (Macmillan)

should attempt to clothe the argument of a past writer in modern garments by introducing a phraseology more familiar to the modern mind. By this means (speaking again to the Marx case) the generalizations believed in and reiterated by generations of Marxians can in some instances at least be brought within range of economic and statistical confirmation or qualification. If for example we can stop talking about rapidity of exploitation according to the "composition of organic capital" i.e., "the proportion of constant and variable capital," and say instead "capital investment per man employed" or "capital investment per man against average wage per man" we can readily compare industries or plot the changing ratio across the years for any one industry, from data already at hand. There may be some loss from the standpoint of mystic appeal but the principle involved can be put to test. Again it seems a bit fatuous at this time, and indeed dangerous to the reputation of the master himself, to repeat after him once more the doctrine of continuing subsistence wages and "increasing misery." Statistics of wage rates per hour, of weekly earnings, of annual average earnings of those who are employed, etc., are readily available for various industries and these can be translated into real wages through the use of cost of living indexes. Mr. Weaver's criticism of the use of such tools provided by governments as intended to mislead the public, together with his resort to British coal mining for his exhibit of decreasing average earnings in the 1820's while neglecting the main current of figures in Canada and the United States which tell quite a different story, reflect the purposeful nature of his message.

H. A. LOGAN.



BUY BOOKS and Pamphlets

from the

CANADIAN FORUM BOOK SERVICE

(Please add postage for pamphlets only and 10% for those published in the U.S.A.)

Send Money Order or Postal Note, or Cheque
Payable at Par

Address

28 WELLINGTON STREET WEST
TORONTO, CANADA

*An Excellent
New Year's Resolution*

Read

THE CANADIAN FORUM

every month during 1943



The cost is only \$2.00. The return to you in intellectual stimulation and pleasure, in worthwhile information on what progressive Canadians are thinking about Canadian and world affairs in this momentous year, cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

